

# TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF: )  
 )  
MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY )  
COMMITTEE FALL MEETING )

## REVISÉD AND CORRECTED TRANSCRIPT

Pages: 1 through 230  
Place: Silver Spring, Maryland  
Date: September 23, 2014

## HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

*Official Reporters*  
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018  
(202) 628-4888  
contracts@hrcourtreporters.com

BEFORE THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC  
ADMINISTRATION

IN THE MATTER OF: )  
 )  
MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY )  
COMMITTEE FALL MEETING )

Fenton Room  
Silver Spring Civic Building  
One Veterans Plaza  
Silver Spring, Maryland

Tuesday,  
September 23, 2014

The parties met, pursuant to the notice, at  
8:43 a.m.

BEFORE: KEITH RIZZARDI  
MAFAC Chairman

## PARTICIPANTS:

MEMBERS:

EDWARD (TED) AMES, Senior Advisor, Penobscot East  
Resource Center (Via Telephone)  
BOB BEAL, Executive Director, ASMFC  
JULIE BONNEY, Executive Director, Alaska  
Groundfish Data Bank, Inc.  
RICHEN (DICK) M. BRAME, Atlantic States Fisheries  
Director, Coastal Conservation Association  
COLUMBUS H. BROWN, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,  
Retired  
TONY CHATWIN, Budget & Strategic Planning  
Subcommittee Chair  
PAUL CLAMPITT, Owner, F/V Augustine  
DAVID DONALDSON, Executive Director, GSMFC

PHILLIP J. DYSKOW, Yamaha Marine Group, Retired  
MICHELE LONGO EDER, JD, Attorney and Owner  
RANDY FISHER, Executive Director, Pacific States  
Marine Fisheries Commission  
ELIZABETH (LIZ) HAMILTON, Executive Director,  
Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association  
JULIE MORRIS, Protected Resources Subcommittee

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

## Chair

GEORGE NARDI, Commerce Subcommittee Chair  
DAVID WALLACE, Ecosystems Subcommittee Chair  
PAMELA YOCHER, DVM, Ph.D., Senior Research  
Scientist and Executive Vice President,  
Hubbs-Sea World Research Institute

## NOAA FISHERIES STAFF:

WHITNEY ANDERSON, Policy Analyst, NMFS  
PAUL DOREMUS, Deputy Assistant Administrator for  
Operations of NOAA Fisheries  
ROGER GRIFFIS, Climate Change Coordinator, NOAA  
Fisheries  
CELESTE LEROUX, NOAA Fisheries  
HEIDI LOVETT, Policy Analyst, NOAA Fisheries  
Office of the Assistant Administrator and  
Acting Designated Federal Officer  
JIM McCALLUM, NOAA Policy Analyst  
SAM RAUCH, Acting Assistant Administrator, NOAA  
ALAN RISENHOOVER, Director, Office of Sustainable  
Fisheries  
HEATHER SAGAR, NMFS, Acting Policy Office Director  
EILEEN SOBECK, Assistant Administrator of NOAA  
Fisheries  
VALERIE TERMINI, NOAA Fisheries  
DONNA WIETING, Director, Office of Protected  
Resources

## OTHER PARTICIPANTS:

TED MORTON, The Pew Charitable Trusts

# C O N T E N T S

	<u>PAGE</u>
Welcome, Roll Call, and Introductions By Keith Rizzardi, Chair	4
NOAA Fisheries Priorities - Overview and Discussion - Programmatic review of NOAA Fisheries priorities for FY 15 and beyond - Budget/fiscal outlook - Review of MAFAC achievements and new opportunities for MAFAC contributions By Eileen Sobeck, Assistant Administrator and Paul Doremus, Deputy Assistant Administration for Operations	6
Break	71
Discussion -- New Opportunities for MAFAC and agenda review for the year By Eileen Sobeck, Assistant Administrator and Keith Rizzardi, Chair	74
Lunch	125
Report from the State Directors Meeting and Fisheries Commissions - Outlook for year ahead By Bob Beal, Executive Director, ASMFC, David Donaldson, Executive Director, GSFMC, and Randy Fisher, Executive Director, PSMFC	126
Climate Discussion - Overview of the NOAA Fisheries Climate Science Strategy - Discuss opportunity for new MAFAC Working Group to inform NOAA Fisheries on climate topics By Roger Griffis, Climate Change Coordinator, NOAA Fisheries	160
Full Committee discussion on climate topics, Led by Ecosystems Subcommittee Chair David Wallace	199
Adjourn	229



1 MS. SOBECK: Eileen Sobeck, NMFS.

2 MR. DOREMUS: Paul Doremus, NMFS, and I'm  
3 acting as your designated federal officer for now  
4 until we have a permanent director of the policy  
5 office. I'll be talking about that later.

6 MS. LOVETT: Heidi Lovett, Office of Policy.

7 MR. NARDI: George Nardi, representing Great  
8 Bay Aquaculture as well as Vancouver.

9 MS. BONNEY: Julie Bonney, representing the  
10 commercial fishing industry, Alaska.

11 MR. CHATWIN: Tony Chatwin with the National  
12 Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

13 MS. LONGO-EDER: Michele Longo-Eder  
14 representing commercial fishing, Oregon.

15 MS. ANDERSON: Whitney Anderson, NMFS.

16 MR. BRAME: I'm Dick Brame, recreational  
17 fishing.

18 MR. DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, Gulf States  
19 Marine Fisheries Commission.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Thank you,  
21 everybody, for attending this morning and for your  
22 participation to date. I have to say I've been very  
23 pleased with how much we've been able to get done over  
24 the telephone. We've had some really good conference  
25 calls of late, and one of the things that will come

1 out in this morning's session is a sense of how much  
2 we've accomplished and then also a discussion of where  
3 we're going to be going over the next few days and  
4 beyond. We've got a busy agenda that's got a deep  
5 dive into recovery planning and aquaculture and  
6 climate change. And I'm really happy that Eileen has  
7 joined us this morning and looking forward to hearing  
8 from her and Paul about all the things we've got in  
9 store. I don't have much more to add than that, so  
10 I'm going to turn it over to Eileen.

11 MS. SOBECK: Great. Thank you, Keith, and  
12 thanks, everyone. This room is set up in sort of a  
13 weird way. I feel like I'm talking to the screen  
14 instead of talking to you guys. But it's really good  
15 to have you guys together and to have an opportunity  
16 to talk to you all directly.

17 I've met a number of you, not everybody, but  
18 a number of you. I was just saying to Liz that I've  
19 been here since the end of January, so it hasn't been  
20 a year, but I feel like I can't get away with saying  
21 that I'm new anymore. I still don't pretend to  
22 understand everything in my agency, but there are a  
23 few facts and themes that are starting to come home to  
24 me.

25 And, you know, I do want to compliment this

1 group because I've worked with a number of advisory  
2 committees over the years, and while there's always a  
3 great mix of people with a lot of ideas, whether or  
4 not those ideas and the input from everybody can  
5 actually be formulated into something that's useful to  
6 the agency, you know, that has more mixed results I'd  
7 say generally.

8 And so I think it's a combination of having,  
9 you know, a strong chair and strong vice chairs,  
10 having you guys really participate and take your jobs  
11 really seriously, and having a good understanding of  
12 our agency and its missions that really have  
13 contributed to the good results.

14 And I think that's really important because  
15 these groups, it's a huge amount of investment of your  
16 time, whether it's just phone calls or in-person  
17 meetings like this. And it also, you know, it also  
18 takes a little bite from our budget and the taxpayers'  
19 dollars, and so it's good to make sure that we get  
20 value for our money, so I really appreciate that.

21 And I think maybe Paul will touch on this a  
22 little bit more, but what I've seen since I've been  
23 here is that the areas where you guys have provided us  
24 guidance at least recently, the examples that I'm  
25 familiar with, whether it was comments on the Magnuson



1 Act or how the ESA is implemented or seafood  
2 certification kinds of issues, those are all live  
3 issues in the Agency. You guys might not have seen  
4 kind of a specific response pop out from us on those  
5 issues, but all of your recommendations have directly  
6 fed into active, important discussions in the period  
7 that I've been on board.

8 And so I think I just want to make sure that  
9 you guys realize that we take the discussions  
10 seriously, but we take the products that you provide  
11 very seriously, and they're important contributions.  
12 And, you know, I mention them in discussions with my  
13 boss, Kathy Sullivan, the Under Secretary and the head  
14 of NOAA, and to others.

15 I will mention the President set up the task  
16 force on IUU Fishing and Seafood Fraud, and Kathy  
17 Sullivan co-chairs that with Cathy Novelli from the  
18 State Department. And we've made sure to let her know  
19 that we've already had a pretty substantial discussion  
20 with you all on a piece of that and that your report  
21 was put out for public comment and went through, you  
22 know, was up for discussion from all of the councils.

23 So, again, I think that that gets noticed as  
24 not just, well, here's, you know, the Agency's off the  
25 top of their head response to some of the issues

1 raised in that task force but that we have been having  
2 thoughtful discussions from groups like you and input  
3 that was developed over time after a lot of thought  
4 and discussion.

5 So, again, I want to thank Keith and to note  
6 that we've asked him and he's accepted to continue as  
7 chair until next October, right? So another year,  
8 which I really appreciate. Sometimes these jobs are  
9 fun, sometimes not so much. I hear that the plane  
10 ride here was in the not so much category.

11 But welcome to Washington, D.C. in the fall.  
12 Better this week than two weeks ago when it was still  
13 probably Florida hot, but really gorgeous today. And  
14 we've asked Julie Morris to be vice chair. Thank you,  
15 Julie. Really appreciate that. And we appreciate the  
16 work of Martin Fisher, who's not here, and David  
17 Wallace, who both provided leadership as vice chair.  
18 So thank you both very much. And also thanks to  
19 Martin, who's not here.

20 So I just wanted to set the stage -- I'm  
21 sorry.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I just want to recognize  
23 Heidi because getting to this point in the planning of  
24 this meeting was largely with her support. She was  
25 extremely helpful, and obviously all of us are sitting

1 here in a well-planned out meeting room because of  
2 her. But the last few months she's been a real help  
3 to me, so thank you.

4 MS. SOBECK: Great, thank you. Thank you,  
5 Heidi.

6 So I wanted to just give you a little bit of  
7 context of kind of the strategic space that we work in  
8 at NMFS and talk a little bit sort of how our missions  
9 kind of nest within leadership of the Department of  
10 Commerce and NOAA so that you understand kind of the  
11 themes, how the work that you guys are going to be  
12 doing fits within the themes that we're working in.

13 To a certain extent I think it's obvious,  
14 but I just think that in understanding what our  
15 priorities are, how they're formulated, how they're  
16 supported by both our budget priorities and our budget  
17 strategies I think will help you see why what you're  
18 doing and why some of the ideas that you've been  
19 discussing and we've been discussing have kind of  
20 bubbled up to the top of our agenda for why your input  
21 could be helpful.

22 And in some ways none of this is a surprise.  
23 I mean, this reminds me of my time at Department of  
24 the Interior. And I don't want to spend too much time  
25 on my backstory. I guess I think most of you know I

1 started out in 1979 at NOAA, so I've come back to my  
2 original bureaucratic home. I started out as a lawyer  
3 in the NOAA Office of General Counsel, I was telling  
4 Liz, at a time when there wasn't one salmon species  
5 listed on the endangered species list. We spent a lot  
6 of time talking about the allocation between the  
7 tribal harvest and nontribal harvest, but that was  
8 about it. So times have changed since then in some  
9 ways.

10           You know, we were still first thinking about  
11 how the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission and Alaska,  
12 you know, subsistence whaling was going to fit into  
13 the framework of the IWC. Some issues haven't changed  
14 that much. Some issues have changed a lot. So after  
15 five years, I ended up going to the Department of  
16 Justice and at least, especially at the beginning,  
17 spent a lot of time litigating NOAA issues, defending  
18 fishery management regs and ESA and MMPA programs,  
19 sometimes successfully, sometimes not so much. I  
20 married my office mate at NOAA General Counsel, so  
21 there was sort of all in the family there for a while.

22           At the Justice Department, I worked with  
23 people like Sam Rauch and Keith and our current  
24 general counsel, Lois Schiffer. So, you know, at the  
25 Justice Department, I worked on mostly NOAA and

1 Interior litigation for a number of years, although I  
2 was there for 25 years and I worked on a lot of other  
3 issues as well, including supervising a group of  
4 environmental prosecutors for 10 years.

5 I then had an opportunity at the beginning  
6 of this Administration to move out of the law and into  
7 the policy realm. So I worked for the Department of  
8 the Interior for about five years in the Office of the  
9 Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.  
10 So that's the part of Interior that works with the  
11 Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park  
12 Service.

13 And I love NOAA and NMFS, but I've got to  
14 say that working with the Park Service and the Fish  
15 and Wildlife Service is pretty special. It's a pretty  
16 special job, it's a pretty special place, and that was  
17 a great experience. But it was a policy job. I  
18 worked with NMFS a fair amount on California water  
19 issues and national ocean policy and Coral Reef Task  
20 Force.

21 And so, when the opportunity to actually  
22 come over here and do not just a policy job, and this  
23 was the great opportunity for me, but to really head  
24 an organization that both had a policy leadership role  
25 and a real operational make it work, boots on the

1 ground role, that was really for me the perfect  
2 opportunity.

3 And so that's what brought me here to NMFS,  
4 and I really, really, really enjoyed that mix. And I  
5 think that I have to acknowledge that the, you know,  
6 leadership under Eric Schwab and then under Sam, I  
7 think it's really been great. I think that the folks  
8 that are affected by our mission have had a hard few  
9 years, but after the last round of Magnuson Act  
10 amendments, I think that the accountability measures  
11 have really turned around a lot of fisheries issues.

12 And so overfishing, you know, it's always  
13 going to be a challenge. It's always something that  
14 the Agency is going to have to work to prevent. But I  
15 think that as we'll see when we discuss things like  
16 climate change, we've now moved into sort of the  
17 future of fisheries management. It's not so much  
18 about managing the behavior of fishermen. It's trying  
19 to figure out what else is involved, and I think  
20 that's the new and exciting challenge for all of us,  
21 how to move into that next era of fisheries management  
22 where we don't necessarily have direct control over  
23 the agents of the factors that are affecting the  
24 resources that we care about or that we're charged  
25 with managing, and so that takes a different mindset.

1           So this is a little bible from the  
2     Department of Commerce. This is the placemat we call  
3     it that has the strategic priorities of the Department  
4     of Commerce. And when I first started, I said, oh, we  
5     must be the green one, and everybody at NOAA, you  
6     know, was like no, we're not green, we're blue. We're  
7     blue. We're the ocean. This was a holdover from my  
8     Interior days. I wasn't in full transition mode yet.

9           But the reason I actually like this and  
10    think it's really important is I think in the olden  
11    days with the Department of Commerce you would never  
12    have seen, you know, the number three big bucks here  
13    with the heading "environment" as one of the five most  
14    important strategic goals of the Department of  
15    Commerce. I think the Department of Commerce lived in  
16    this world where, you know, yeah, NOAA was there and,  
17    you know, when put together the number of people in  
18    real estate from the Weather Service, it accounted for  
19    a big part of the Department of Commerce budget, but  
20    it really wasn't a fundamental part of the Department  
21    of Commerce's goal in a way that Fish and Wildlife  
22    Service is completely integral to what the Department  
23    of the Interior does.

24           And so I think, you know, there's still  
25    headings here, "traded investment," "innovation,"

1 "data," "operational excellence." And in some ways,  
2 you know, elements of those other strategic goals  
3 actually apply to NOAA in some fundamental ways I  
4 think. You know, traded investment, we're talking  
5 about an industry here, fishing industry. Innovation,  
6 we're going to need some innovation to deal with some  
7 of the issues of the future of fishing. Data, I mean,  
8 we might not be talking big data in quite the same way  
9 that the Weather Service is, but what's happening out  
10 there in the ocean involves a lot of information.

11 But fundamentally, you know, there is a  
12 strategic goal in the Department of Commerce plan,  
13 which is to ensure that communities and businesses  
14 have the necessary information, products, and services  
15 to prepare and prosper in a changing environment.  
16 And, you know, that's really what we're about.  
17 There's sort of a subunit, a subobjective, a subgoal,  
18 which is to foster healthy and sustainable marine  
19 resources, habitats, and ecosystem through improved  
20 management and partnerships.

21 And that is the goal on this chart that's  
22 the principal responsibility of NOAA and the National  
23 Marine Fisheries Service to deliver to the Department  
24 of Commerce. And I guess why I'm saying this is  
25 important is that we go report on this on a regular



1 basis directly to the Secretary of Commerce about how  
2 we are working to achieve this goal, and our  
3 performance is judged on how well we do on that. And  
4 I see Celeste nodding her head. You know, I could be  
5 wrong. I don't think that that happened in the past.  
6 I don't think that the Secretary of Commerce thought  
7 very often about how the marine environment was doing.

8 And I do think that we've done -- and by  
9 "we," I mean Kathy Sullivan, our boss -- a really good  
10 job of helping us think about how our mission fits  
11 within this goal. And we provide services, science  
12 and management services that foster this healthy and  
13 sustainable resources theme. It's kind of  
14 encapsulated in the language of resiliency, which is  
15 sort of the new formulation of this kind of concept,  
16 and our boss, Kathy Sullivan, sees resiliency as  
17 encompassing ecological resiliency, community  
18 resiliency, and economic resiliency. And I think much  
19 of what we do, most of what we do can be easily  
20 formulated in those terms.

21 And when she goes and talks to the  
22 Department of Commerce, she usually starts out by  
23 saying before you fall asleep, the reason you should  
24 care about what we do is that, whether it's commercial  
25 or recreational fisheries or ecotourism and whale

1 watching, the resources that we care about support  
2 coastal communities, provide jobs, and involve  
3 hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, and  
4 whether it's exports or fisheries products or  
5 services, community services associated with fishing  
6 and fisheries products, and you should really care  
7 about that. And she starts out with a map with  
8 numbers.

9           And it really sets the stage for why you  
10 should care about what we do, why we do a lot with  
11 relatively few resources and why our programs need to  
12 be continued to be funded. Really many of us sitting  
13 in this room might understand why our next generation  
14 science is really important. If you're the Secretary  
15 of Commerce, that's not necessarily obvious to you.

16           So building up and bolstering the case for  
17 why our budgets are really important and why every  
18 dollar that we lose hurts communities and the  
19 economics of the nation and why every dollar that we  
20 get can be put to good use I think is a really, really  
21 important concept these days. You've got to be able  
22 to tell your story and we've got to understand our  
23 priorities so that when an opportunity arises we know  
24 where we can put our time and energy and resources.

25           We actually have a great story to tell.

1       What we do is really important. Our mission is really  
2       important even if it's a somewhat narrow mission in  
3       the kind of broader scheme of sort of the federal  
4       picture. And so I think that sort of focusing our  
5       story and really understanding both how to tell it and  
6       how to live it has become ever more important.

7               Paul is going to tell you the budget story  
8       here in a little bit, and just to kind of set the  
9       stage so everybody sort of understands where we are in  
10      resources. During the sort of bad budget years, our  
11      resources weren't cut across the board. Certain  
12      areas, like protected resources, were hurt more than  
13      other areas.

14             I think if we don't agree with that as being  
15      the appropriate set of priorities, then it's our job  
16      to explain better what our mission is and how we  
17      accomplish it and why we need more resources to do  
18      that. It's not a matter of telling a better story.  
19      It's really articulating better what we do.

20             And I do think that we as an Agency have  
21      been trying to do that in a more systematic way, and  
22      we've had no choice, as have many other agencies, to  
23      the extent that there have been cuts and that getting  
24      additional resources is extremely difficult. We've  
25      really done a lot of soul searching about what's

1     important, what matters, how do we do it the best way  
2     we can, what are our science priorities, what are our  
3     management priorities, both short-term and long-term.  
4     We had some healthy discussion at the state directors  
5     meeting a couple weeks ago, and I think Randy and  
6     others will be reporting out, but, you know, talking  
7     about that long-term, short-term science mix.

8             So getting input from you all on these  
9     issues to help us formulate those alternatives or  
10    those priorities, try to explain sort of where there  
11    is room to innovate, how we're going to address some  
12    of the emerging issues that are facing us like climate  
13    change, I think it's really essential to helping us go  
14    through that exercise, whether it's developing  
15    strategic plans for our NMFS regions, whether it's  
16    coordinating the science side and the management side  
17    in a more explicit way. Doing all of those things  
18    will be aided by the kind of input that we can get  
19    from you on specific issues about how we should  
20    accomplish our goals, what some of the challenges are,  
21    and how we should be setting our priorities.

22            So, in this kind of framework of Department  
23    of Commerce, that's been translated through the NOAA  
24    system into sort of two main priorities, and they're  
25    really simple and they really shouldn't surprise

1     anybody, which are our sort of core stewardship and  
2     regulatory mandates are sustainable fisheries,  
3     ensuring the productivity and sustainability of  
4     fishing and fishing communities, and protected  
5     resources, recovering and conserving protected  
6     resources.

7                So we achieve these goals through science-  
8     based decision-making. The science isn't the goal.  
9     The science provides us the information and the tools  
10    to make our decisions. I mean, it's a pretty simple  
11    system. All of our other programs really feed into  
12    those two main mandates.

13              So, for instance, habitat. It's not that  
14    habitat isn't an incredibly important area. In fact,  
15    it is. I think it's sort of an emerging area of  
16    importance. Habitat is not important as just some  
17    esoteric line on a map. Habitat is important because  
18    it supports sustainable fisheries or it helps recover  
19    protected species.

20              I think habitat, I don't know if it's been  
21    on your agenda, whether you guys have discussed it,  
22    but there's been sort of a change of approach within  
23    NMFS, which I think was a really wise one, to, you  
24    know, not engage in 1,000 small acts of random habitat  
25    kindness but to really focus our habit program on

1 areas that will serve our fisheries' mission. And  
2 while, you know, there are some small individual  
3 programs, great projects all along the coastline that  
4 our habitat program historically has invested in, I  
5 think that we've decided that more concentrated,  
6 concerted efforts that are more directly related to  
7 this mission/mandate is more appropriate for helping  
8 us decide where we're going to put our habitat  
9 dollars.

10 And I think it's really paid off. I think  
11 that it has again focused support and attention from  
12 our political betters and from our appropriators on  
13 why we should be spending, why they should be spending  
14 money on habitat areas, and I think that that's going  
15 to be really productive.

16 It's also allowed us to coordinate in a more  
17 fundamental way with other lines of NOAA, like the  
18 National Ocean Service and other agencies, to say,  
19 okay, the National Ocean Service is really interested  
20 in green infrastructure and coastal areas and how that  
21 can protect coastal communities. Well, those are the  
22 same areas. We're interested in essential fish  
23 habitat or how coastal areas contribute to offshore  
24 fisheries resources.

25 We're interested in the same areas sort of

1 for different reasons, but there's a lot of economies  
2 of scale in terms of research and investment of  
3 research dollars or vessel time or survey time. And  
4 it can often serve the same communities, like a  
5 community that wants to make sure that it's going to  
6 be safe from storm surges in addition, you know, is  
7 often a community that has a lot of investment in  
8 fisheries. So we can bolster the economy in multiple  
9 ways.

10 So I think, again, habitat. We are focusing  
11 on habitat that serves our two main mandates, but it's  
12 I think going to be a more enhanced area of policy and  
13 investment as a result. The same with aquaculture  
14 that we'll go into a bit more detail. Sometimes it's  
15 hard to get to aquaculture because it's not mandated  
16 in the same way that management of wild caught  
17 fisheries is, and when you're looking at a dollar and  
18 you have a mandatory duty and a not so mandatory duty,  
19 you know, you have somewhat limited discretion on what  
20 you can do.

21 I do think, though, that when we look at  
22 sustainable fisheries and we're looking at how that  
23 contributes to the economy of coastal communities, we  
24 would be fools not to recognize that in the future  
25 there's going to be more than one kind of fishery out

1       there. There's going to be the wild caught fisheries  
2       and there's the potential of aquaculture. We  
3       certainly import a lot of aquaculture product into the  
4       United States. Those are jobs that could conceivably  
5       be jobs here in the United States. Obviously doing  
6       aquaculture has to be cited responsibly, permitted  
7       responsibly, conducted responsibly. We have a higher  
8       chance of doing that if it's something that is done  
9       here in the United States under federal regulation  
10      than if it's done in some other country where we  
11      actually have no control over the conditions.

12                Again, aquaculture isn't a box floating out  
13      there all by itself. It's a box that's connected to  
14      the larger issue of sustainable fisheries and what the  
15      future of sustainable fisheries is. And, again, I  
16      think thinking about how any of the issues that we're  
17      dealing with, how they relate to our core functions,  
18      helps us figure out what is the most fruitful federal  
19      role, if any, in these issues. How and why are we  
20      getting involved? What are our goals? What kinds of  
21      services to community and economic resilience are we  
22      providing when we invest in those issues?

23                So, with that being said, you know, given  
24      that lens, we're going to continue to implement  
25      ecosystem-based management. I think that, you know,



1     that can't be done everywhere overnight, but I think  
2     that we all know that just looking at single species  
3     in a vacuum works in some places, but there are many  
4     places where it doesn't. So I think the goal is to,  
5     as we get the tools to do that, to move towards more  
6     ecosystem-based management. Focus on community  
7     resilience and just I think figure out again how to  
8     keep the infrastructure of the Agency, including our  
9     physical infrastructure, vital enough to attack these  
10    next generation problems.

11           I think the other theme that I've been  
12    seeing is everybody takes very seriously this science-  
13    based need for management and guidance, and everybody  
14    wants the best science available for their fisheries,  
15    for their communities. And everybody recognizes that  
16    the old tools, the old science tools aren't good  
17    enough anymore, and there are a lot of exciting new  
18    potential tools out there.

19           But, you know, science tools aren't cheap  
20    anymore, if they ever were. We have an aging fleet.  
21    We have some brand new cool labs and a lot of really  
22    old deteriorating laboratories. Everybody reads a lot  
23    about NOAA satellite systems and the Weather Service  
24    satellites and how that's an aging set of  
25    infrastructure that supports a really important

1 function. We have that same issue here at NOAA for  
2 the NOAA fleet and the NMFS laboratories.

3 If we're going to be a science-based service  
4 agency, how do we keep our science cutting-edge in an  
5 era when we don't really have the budgets to do that?  
6 That's a constant concern for us. I know Paul has  
7 given that a lot of thought and maybe will say  
8 something about that. But trying to figure out how  
9 we're going to continue to have a fleet for the  
10 future, how we're going to have laboratories that  
11 provide the kinds of very sophisticated stock  
12 assessment work that our communities demand is an  
13 ever-increasing challenge.

14 So I think there's a lot of really  
15 interesting new ways for us to be thoughtful, a lot of  
16 groundbreaking to be done about where we go, how we  
17 kind of direct our resources and our priorities in the  
18 future, but a lot of challenges about how to do that  
19 given where we are realistically on the budget.

20 So I think with that, sort of a more high-  
21 level look at sort of how we are approaching our  
22 policy and budget priorities. I'm going to turn it  
23 over to Paul to say a few things more specific about  
24 the recommendations and the work of MAFAC itself and  
25 then to give you a little bit of our budget overview.

1 I know that you guys maybe don't need to know  
2 everything there is to know about our budget, but I  
3 think it is helpful if you guys have a sense of where  
4 we are, where we've been, kind of what our strategy  
5 is, how we approach our budget. So thank you.

6 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Eileen. It's a  
7 great pleasure to have the opportunity to speak with  
8 you today. We have a few other segments of our  
9 introductory kind of observations. One is to have a  
10 little bit of a lookback now on the accomplishments of  
11 the committee, but this is all in, of course, the  
12 budget policy context where we stand as an agency in a  
13 broader national policy and budgetary debate.

14 And all this is leading towards a broader  
15 discussion. We'll come back to Eileen in a few  
16 minutes before our open session after break, stepping  
17 back and looking more strategically at the potential  
18 work portfolio of the committee to continue on what I  
19 think has been, we all think in the Fisheries  
20 Leadership Team has been a remarkably productive and  
21 very influential work plan that the committee has  
22 pursued over recent years.

23 So I want to thank everybody for that. But  
24 before getting to that specifically, I do want to  
25 acknowledge where we are here just in the management

1 of the committee, as has always been the case, out of  
2 our policy office until this past spring under the  
3 leadership of Mark Holliday, whom you all got to know,  
4 especially the Chair, particularly well. And he  
5 served very ably in that capacity. We've been in  
6 transition since then, as you know, and have  
7 advertised for a new backfill for that position.

8           It's a very, very significant position in  
9 our front office, along with our communications lead,  
10 along with our CFO. These are three of the major  
11 pieces from a sort of finance, policy, programmatic,  
12 and communications outreach point of view. These are  
13 three really major sources of strategic advice and  
14 guidance to the front office that we rely on very  
15 heavily and anticipate doing so even to a greater  
16 extent in the future as we move forward in the type of  
17 environment that Eileen just described.

18           So we're really looking forward to a very  
19 competitive slate of candidates for this position.  
20 It's a fabulous position. It's a rare type of  
21 position in this area, in our whole policy area, not  
22 just our organization but generally speaking. And  
23 that's a very exciting opportunity for us.

24           As many of you may have heard, our HR  
25 processes evolve gradually. We are at a critical

1 point where we expect to get a list of people who made  
2 the certification fairly soon, and then we'll be able  
3 to work through rating and ranking processes,  
4 interview processes, and then the actual on-boarding.  
5 So this could take a few months. We'll keep you  
6 apprised. We'll certainly let the Chair know where we  
7 stand.

8 But in the meantime I'm going to serve in  
9 the role that Mark served as we in particular start  
10 this process of looking forward to the work product  
11 and the kind of focus areas of the committee. We want  
12 to stay very closely engaged as your leadership team  
13 here for fisheries in that process and get things  
14 going in a direction that the new policy office  
15 director can subsequently pick up on.

16 I do want to acknowledge we have had, as is  
17 the case I think throughout our organization,  
18 throughout fisheries, we have some of the most  
19 dedicated, committed, mission-driven staff that you  
20 could ever expect to see in public service. We have  
21 them here in our policy office as well. Several of  
22 them have been serving in acting capacity over the  
23 course of the last several months. We're all short-  
24 handed. They're short-handed. And we've been keeping  
25 things going.

1           I'll certainly join Keith in his recognition  
2   of Heidi for her efforts in keeping the committee  
3   going. It's been yeoman's work. It always is.  
4   There's so much more to making these kinds of events  
5   happen in the backdrop than any of us ever realize.  
6   And she's been working with the assistance of Whitney  
7   Anderson and others in the policy office. Whitney  
8   recently came on board to help us out and has made an  
9   enormous contribution. I want to acknowledge that.

10           And Heidi has been among three people --  
11   Heather Sagar is here today currently acting as the  
12   policy office director. Heidi served in that capacity  
13   briefly and also Jessica Kondel as we've kind of  
14   worked towards this process of bringing on board a  
15   full-up policy office director. So we've got a great  
16   team here, and thanks to all of them for helping make  
17   this meeting happen and for getting us positioned to  
18   take the next step with MAFAC in its sort of evolution  
19   as a formal federal advisory committee for fisheries.

20           And with that in mind, I wanted to at least  
21   take a minute to step back as we look ahead to what  
22   the potential portfolio of topic areas might look  
23   like. I do want to look at that in the context of  
24   some of the past work that the committee has done and  
25   that we are committed to and continuing to engage and

1 work with.

2 For me, it's interesting. It goes back  
3 quite a way before my time here as the deputy  
4 assistant administrator for operations in Fisheries.  
5 I used to function basically as NOAA's chief strategy  
6 officer for a number of years, and my first  
7 introduction to the committee, I was working with all  
8 of the federal advisory committees across NOAA and  
9 worked with a committee on the broad strategy for NOAA  
10 as a whole.

11 And this is the only committee of all of  
12 those that NOAA has had the good fortune of working  
13 with under FACA, and there are many of varying degrees  
14 of scope. There's the Science Advisory Board, which  
15 is comprehensive, and then there are a range of other  
16 committees that serve specific programmatic functions.

17 MAFAC is one of the most comprehensive for  
18 the entirety of our Fisheries mission portfolio and I  
19 think has been one of the most active and I think  
20 forward-thinking of the committees that NOAA has been  
21 able to draw from. The Vision 2020 document was my  
22 early introduction to that, and it was one of the most  
23 solid pieces of strategic advice that we got from our  
24 advisory committees for NOAA as a whole looking  
25 forward over this 20-, 25-year timeframe that we were

1 looking for at the time in the development of the NOAA  
2 next generation strategic plan.

3 That is still the guiding plan for NOAA. It  
4 set forward some of the key strategies that NOAA has  
5 been pursuing for some time now, not the least of  
6 which is our goal, our broad, overarching vision, if  
7 you will, for healthy ocean ecosystems, and that's  
8 been a framework within that for looking at what we  
9 are doing across the entirety of the organization in  
10 Fisheries and complementary efforts in NOS and in  
11 particular with our ocean atmospheric research  
12 community where we have been drawing ever more tightly  
13 into our sort of research orbit, particularly as we  
14 grapple with some of these very, very huge system  
15 stressors.

16 We were talking just a few minutes ago about  
17 climate and other major long-term trends, human-  
18 induced changes to the environment, what that means  
19 for our trust responsibilities. Those are all areas  
20 that were recognized in Vision 2020. They were  
21 recognized in NOAA's strategic plan. They continue to  
22 be major programmatic foundational concepts for the  
23 organization. And I think that that document that you  
24 all produced back in 2007 was then and continues to be  
25 a very significant source of intellectual guidance to



1 the organization, and that was quite a major  
2 contribution.

3 We have also more recent products that the  
4 full fruition is to be determined, but one of the ones  
5 that we're pushing forward very aggressively is your  
6 recent recommendation on seafood sustainability and  
7 certification. This is hugely relevant to industry,  
8 to the nation generally, the topic that Eileen  
9 mentioned earlier that she and Kathy Sullivan are very  
10 heavily engaged in on behalf of the Administration, on  
11 IUU fishing and on seafood fraud.

12 It's touched on by that issue. The issue of  
13 traceability is central to that whole debate. These  
14 are separate things, and I think some of the guidance  
15 you provided as well as subsequent work that we've  
16 taken on has enabled us to engage in that discussion  
17 more productively.

18 And we are still figuring out what the way  
19 ahead is. It's a very complex issue, as you well  
20 know. It was a challenging issue for the committee to  
21 address. And I think it represents in my mind one of  
22 the benefits of having the very diverse array of  
23 constituent interests present in this room to be able  
24 to work through the types of issues that, you know, in  
25 microcosm here we have in large measure representation

1 of our broader constituent community, and it really  
2 helps us progress when we come into territory that  
3 involve these kinds of challenging policy and  
4 programmatic questions. So that is an enormous  
5 contribution, and we're continuing to press ahead on  
6 that. It is certainly timely, relevant, and a very  
7 high priority for us.

8 On the other small policy front, MSA  
9 reauthorization, another topic of enormous  
10 significance. Many of you played a really essential  
11 role in Managing Our Nation's Fisheries III. That was  
12 a remarkable event in many respects, particularly for  
13 those of you who were in prior Managing Our Nation's  
14 Fisheries III events that were much more intense at a  
15 time when policy was much more contingent.

16 And I think the underlying message that all  
17 of us seem to have taken out of Managing Our Nation's  
18 Fisheries III, that Magnuson is a fairly well-  
19 structured policy instrument, that it is at root  
20 working, that there may be opportunities for  
21 refinement, but don't mess with a good thing. That  
22 was an incredible place to get to, and many of you  
23 contributed directly to that discussion.

24 There were recommendations for a definition  
25 of subsistence fishing. It's one of these areas where

1 Magnuson was a little oblique, and that has helped  
2 considerably. And we are continuing to work on a  
3 range of different topics. There's a huge array, too  
4 much to get into now, under consideration as Congress  
5 considers the possibility of reauthorization, as well  
6 as our work on rules, such as National Standard I.

7           So we don't know where Congress is going to  
8 go. I'm going to make some comments on where we are  
9 in our congressional context with the budget that sort  
10 of apply here. But while there's a lot of interest,  
11 some large policy issues right now, given the state of  
12 play in the political cycle coming up on midterms, a  
13 lot of issues are more or less in neutral.

14           We kind of see MSA reauthorization in that  
15 territory, but that doesn't mean it's the end of the  
16 story. That just means, I believe, a pause in the  
17 process, and the issues will get picked back up, and I  
18 think the voice of this committee will have definitely  
19 a significant bearing on how we tend to those issues.

20           Another area that's, you know, got a one-  
21 word tagline but is a major issue for the nation --  
22 Eileen referred to this as well in her opening  
23 comments -- is aquaculture. A huge, huge bearing on  
24 the future of the nation's seafood supply, something  
25 that is central to our whole concept of sustainable

1 fisheries long-term, and that has been an important  
2 topic of the committee for quite some time over the  
3 past decade.

4 That was a major feature in Vision 2020, and  
5 I remember some table-thumping back at that time, what  
6 is our domestic seafood production strategy and very  
7 challenging questions like that that NOAA, that  
8 Fisheries, that the Administration continue to debate.  
9 And there's been a lot of progress over that time  
10 period. MAFAC has influenced that enormously,  
11 influenced the departmental and NOAA aquaculture  
12 policies, the 10-year strategic plan for aquaculture,  
13 aquaculture research and development priorities.

14 And we will be picking back up on that where  
15 we are today, where we may need to go forward, where  
16 the committee may be able to contribute in the future  
17 on this topic that only continues to grow in  
18 prominence and people's thinking when it comes to  
19 sustainable seafood and to our mission mandates. So  
20 we'll pick that topic back up in greater depth and,  
21 again, it will benefit from the long work stream that  
22 came out of this committee.

23 Another area too that is on the agenda  
24 today, less for consideration and more for an update  
25 that also I think was substantially affected by the

1 work of the committee is our recreational fishing  
2 work. We'll be hearing from Russ and Ken later, but  
3 the Recreational Fisheries Working Group was stood up,  
4 got a senior advisor, two national Recreation Fishing  
5 summits, very successful engagement. That engagement  
6 is a full and standing commitment of this Agency, and  
7 this committee I think contributed substantially to us  
8 figuring out how to do that, to get that started in a  
9 meaningful way that we now view as central to our  
10 operations.

11 It was a new concept, and we now are blazing  
12 ahead on what we consider to be a routine and  
13 necessary part of how we do business. And we'll look  
14 forward to covering that agenda a little bit later,  
15 but I just want to thank you here for all the  
16 contributions that the committee made to getting us to  
17 that point.

18 And finally, a little bit earlier in its  
19 formation but no less significant were the efforts of  
20 the ESA Working Group. We have a very specific set of  
21 consensus recommendations regarding Section 7  
22 consultations that came out of that endorsed by the  
23 councils and the CCC. This has been very visible and  
24 broadly brought forward. And we are currently inside  
25 the organization working on the best way to implement

1       these recommendations, so that was again an enormous  
2       contribution, and it's going to directly affect the  
3       work of the organization.

4               So these are from my experience having  
5       worked over the years with a number of federal  
6       advisory committees for different agencies as well as  
7       different parts of NOAA, different parts of the  
8       Department, I would hold the work of MAFAC up at the  
9       top in terms of the relevance of its efforts and the  
10      extent to which the outcome from the committee has  
11      directly played into the work of the organization.

12             At the highest levels of our policy  
13      considerations -- MSA, seafood sustainability  
14      certification -- the broad strategic thinking that the  
15      committee has influenced both for fisheries and for  
16      NOAA as a whole, as well as some of these specific  
17      domains where we needed to improve policy and practice  
18      that the committee has enabled us to make great  
19      progress with.

20             So we are very much looking forward to the  
21      conversation later this morning where we can challenge  
22      all of ourselves how do you step up from that track  
23      record and take it to the next level, as they always  
24      say, and look at some of the most challenging issues,  
25      the areas where we need the functions of a federal

1 advisory committee to actually get to and productively  
2 work, where we need the representative capability that  
3 all of you bring from the various communities that you  
4 in effect represent and come from and are familiar  
5 with the thinking of.

6           It is an enormously powerful effort and  
7 venue, if you will, for us to work through a range of  
8 different challenging issue areas, and we are really  
9 looking forward to getting into that discussion. But  
10 in the meantime, thank you all for that incredible  
11 work stream and all the efforts that you have  
12 contributed to to get us to this point. We know  
13 you're not in it for the money or the roller coaster  
14 plane rides on the way to our meetings in Silver  
15 Spring, you know, right along the coast with the  
16 beautiful vistas of waves outside.

17           It is a lot of work. We recognize that. A  
18 lot of you make personal sacrifices to get here,  
19 particularly those of you coming extraordinary  
20 distances to do so. And the commitment that you have  
21 made to the committee is one that we are very, very  
22 grateful for, we continue to be grateful for, and I  
23 want to acknowledge that commitment and engagement.

24           It is at your level I think consonant with  
25 the type of commitment and engagement of our staff

1       that I was referring to earlier, and that's part of  
2       what makes our jobs here in Fisheries particularly  
3       pleasurable and rewarding. I say that personally from  
4       my vantage point.

5               I do also want to recognize that every good  
6       thing has its term, right, and we have some committee  
7       members that their terms are up, six-year terms. A  
8       couple folks couldn't be with us here today. Martin  
9       Fisher, Patty Doerr are at their six-year term.  
10      Martin served as vice chair for over a year. Patty I  
11      remember from Vision 2020 days. She was very, very  
12      central to that whole effort. And we wish they were  
13      able to be here in person to recognize them. Heidi is  
14      digging up some certificates that we will use to  
15      acknowledge them.

16             But we do have two folks here in the same  
17      position, George being one of them, enormous service  
18      to the organization as chair of the Commerce  
19      Subcommittee for over three years and throughout your  
20      tenure on the committee. And we do want to thank you  
21      for that service just as I acknowledged, as well as  
22      Dave Wallace, chair of the Ecosystems Subcommittee  
23      over three years.

24             It is hard to see the type of expertise and  
25      experience that you all represent stepping off the



1 committee. This is one of the things that you kind of  
2 grind your teeth over. It is a necessary part of our  
3 process for bringing in new voices, but we're only  
4 able to do that with the recognition of the  
5 extraordinary effort that you all have made, all four  
6 of you, over the course of six years. And it won't be  
7 the end of you hearing from us, just not hearing from  
8 us in the context of the formal committee process,  
9 which might be welcome news to you after so many  
10 committee meetings. I don't know. But we do want to  
11 thank you for your great service to Fisheries and to  
12 Commerce and to the nation by service on the  
13 committee. Thank you very much.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. WALLACE: Thank you. I appreciate it  
16 very much.

17 MR. DOREMUS: And Heidi didn't tell you we  
18 were expecting 10- to 15-minute speeches for --

19 (Laughter.)

20 MALE SPEAKER: You go first.

21 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you. Thank you. It's  
22 difficult to acknowledge your contribution, and your  
23 entire team here is very grateful. Thank you very  
24 much.

25 All right. On to the fun stuff, the budget,

1       everybody's favorite topic. Were we able to pull the  
2       screen down for that?

3               One of the challenges of these meetings that  
4       folks are coming in here with different levels of  
5       knowledge of what's going on, greater and lesser  
6       distances to Washington. Sometimes it's a great,  
7       great benefit to be literally and figuratively far  
8       away from the commotion here in D.C. But what we'd  
9       like to do here is take a few minutes to update the  
10      committee. And this is again I think significant not  
11      just for where we are with our dollars but where are  
12      we strategically positioned in our budget and policy  
13      community and what that might mean.

14             This does shape some of the discussion  
15      coming forward about our focus areas and what we might  
16      take on -- thank you, Heidi -- in the coming year plus  
17      as far as your work portfolio. So some of you may  
18      have seen some of this already. I will try to move  
19      relatively briskly through this so that there's time  
20      for at least discussion on the policy or on the budget  
21      front, and then we will take a few minutes to review  
22      some of the potential work portfolio items before we  
23      break and have a broader discussion of the way ahead  
24      for the committee.

25             So this will be a fiscal update, budget

1 status type of thing as you're accustomed to seeing  
2 around this time each year. It's important context.  
3 And by the way, I have here engaging in the process,  
4 and we have been talking in a variety of venues, most  
5 recently the state directors meeting. And we're very  
6 pleased that both Randy and Dave are here today to  
7 talk from their perspective of what came out of that.  
8 But in addition to the specifics of our budget, you'll  
9 hear us talk about very frequently and I will in  
10 terrible detail in a few minutes about the new budget  
11 reality that we face. Eileen referred to some of  
12 these pressures earlier.

13 Our typical mode of doing business, a big  
14 problem facing federal government, frame up solution,  
15 ask Congress for money, get money, implement solution,  
16 is not really the dominant path ahead of us in the  
17 future. We don't foresee that working the way that it  
18 used to. We'll talk about where we are and why and  
19 how much things have changed.

20 But when we talk about engaging in the  
21 process here, we are definitely stepping back and  
22 looking at how our organization works with virtually  
23 everyone that touches our mission. Some of that is in  
24 very significant strategic ways. Our strategic  
25 partners in the states we were particularly focused on

1 and have been for some period of time. They are in  
2 effect co-producers of the value of sustainable  
3 fisheries and the conservation and protection of our  
4 trust resources.

5 And we can't get our work done without them,  
6 without our tribal co-managers, without many others  
7 literally sharing in the same work program. Some of  
8 the work Eileen alluded to in habitat has been  
9 influenced by this type of thinking. How can we get a  
10 bigger effect on level dollars? This is a  
11 concentration of forces from different sectors.

12 So engaging in the process is not just  
13 engaging in the budget process. It is engaging in the  
14 work of our mission. It is not just our direct work  
15 but what it is that we're trying to achieve for the  
16 nation, and that's the framing in my mind for our  
17 broader discussion about our program portfolio in the  
18 future.

19 Engaging in the process is also about  
20 engaging in the budget process, and we talked a lot  
21 about that in the state directors meeting and in other  
22 venues. And I do want to acknowledge here kind of  
23 skating right up to the edge of the boundary  
24 conditions, right, of a federal advisory committee.  
25 You all as a federal advisory committee formally are

1 charged with advising us. You are not as an advisory  
2 committee in a position to engage Congress in the  
3 budget process, but each of you by virtue of your work  
4 on the advisory committee have become, if you will,  
5 sort of uber-constituents. You know an awful lot as  
6 individuals, as representatives of your individual  
7 communities that you represent about the work of the  
8 organization, about the needs that the nation faces in  
9 this domain. You all have and are in a distinctive  
10 position to engage in budget and policy discussions on  
11 your own terms.

12 And some federal advisory committee members  
13 to different degrees and in different committees do  
14 take advantage of the opportunity to do that during  
15 their time in Washington. That is always something  
16 that is your individual choice. And I just wanted to  
17 acknowledge that that's part of the engagement  
18 construct here as well.

19 So, as we get back in the final slides we'll  
20 talk about the budget cycle and how things work, and a  
21 lot of this you may be familiar with and where we're  
22 looking for potential changes in how many of us can  
23 engage in the process. And I just wanted to  
24 acknowledge the particular function of the advisory  
25 committee once removed in the budget process, but all

1 of you as individuals representing your communities  
2 can very directly engage as any well-informed citizen  
3 can as you move forward in viewing what you think are  
4 national needs.

5 We're going to start here with '14 and then  
6 move through where Congress is with '15 and a little  
7 bit of outlook from there. As you know, we are  
8 actively managing at any point in time three budgets.  
9 We're executing the current year budget, we're working  
10 typically with Congress considering our current step  
11 into the next year, so we're working with Congress on  
12 FY '14. We're closing the FY '14 now. We're working  
13 with Congress on '15, and we're working with the  
14 Administration on the thoughts for '16. And believe  
15 it or not, we are about to start the FY '17 process as  
16 well. And some of our discussions here today may  
17 relate to that.

18 I do want to acknowledge here and have made  
19 this a significant point in discussions with others.  
20 FY '14 was a welcome breath. It was kind of like  
21 coming up for air after being under water just a  
22 little bit too long, you know, a couple wave hold-  
23 down, and it's a big gasp after FY '13 and the dropoff  
24 in our budget, about 12 and a half percent from '10 to  
25 '11 to '12 to '13.

1           There was a significant compression in our  
2     organization. We've talked about that a lot here. We  
3     lost over 300 positions in Fisheries, and we have not  
4     built those back. We've stabilized the decline, so  
5     our curve now has flattened, but it is not building  
6     back up, and that has a significant bearing on our  
7     productive capacity that often goes unnoticed. Not  
8     just in the policy office, but throughout Fisheries I  
9     see on a routine basis people at every level of the  
10    organization pulling out the stops to try to continue  
11    doing what we have always done with 300 fewer people  
12    around. And it is a significant source of stress in  
13    the organization. From an operational point of view,  
14    I worry about that. It is not sustainable.

15           So some of what we need to recognize I think  
16    in closing out FY '14, yes, it was a four and a half  
17    percent off of what we hoped to be our floor in FY  
18    '13, but I'm not so sure given the breadth of our  
19    mission responsibilities that it's a sustainable pace  
20    that we can maintain.

21           The other thing I want to acknowledge about  
22    FY '14, good year that it was, we got a budget in  
23    January, a great thing. None of us expected it that  
24    quickly. And then we spent, Congress spent, the  
25    Administration spent, all of us spent five months, it

1       wasn't until late June that we actually got authority  
2       to spend that money, and that created all the same  
3       complications that you get when Congress delays its  
4       budget decisions for various reasons.

5               That was a source of significant pressure  
6       not just on our organization but on all of the people  
7       who receive money from us. Our councils, our  
8       commissions, our grantees throughout the nation did  
9       not know where things stood until the 11th hour. We  
10      had to execute a ridiculous percentage of our budget  
11      in the fourth quarter, and it's just pretty close to  
12      impossible to run a really efficient machine when  
13      you're operating that way. So while FY '14 was a good  
14      year and we're closing it out now, it was also a  
15      difficult year because of this whole spend plan  
16      process.

17             We are actively talking about this with the  
18      Administration, with Congress. It is important for  
19      us. We never want to do anything other than meet the  
20      information, needs, and requirements of our  
21      congressional and Administration overseers, but this  
22      is a challenging way to do it. We think it could be  
23      done much more efficiently, and there so far seem to  
24      be receptive ears on that front.

25             So we're cautiously optimistic that if we



1 are able to get a budget that we won't get held up  
2 until the 11th hour with the spend plan review  
3 process, and that is something that I think is very  
4 significant and an important way that we could at no  
5 cost improve government efficiency and effectiveness  
6 enormously. So that was our FY '14 experience.

7 I want to put FY '14, '15 as well, where we  
8 are today in the context of our history. And this is  
9 the new budget reality. I think probably most of you  
10 have seen this chart. We update it every budget year  
11 and at midpoints. The midpoint here in FY '10 is sort  
12 of the inversion point. We had a history here in the  
13 wake of the last MSA reauthorization at this time of  
14 building budgets to recognize growing mission  
15 requirements and the requirements that went with the  
16 Magnuson kind of reconstitution, if you will, during  
17 this time period.

18 This was also a classic time period of  
19 Administration proposals being significantly lower  
20 than our enacted budgets, so this yellow line, this  
21 yellow bar is the Administration proposal. And each  
22 year Congress was upping it significantly.

23 This was the era of earmarks. There's many  
24 decades of experience with earmarks prior to that.  
25 And it was one of the very significant changes, sort

1 of institutional changes that took place between  
2 period A and period B is the congressional decision to  
3 forego formal hard earmarks around that time. And  
4 that was the end of that pattern.

5 The other obvious driver to this change  
6 where you now see presidential budgets in yellow  
7 exceeding our enacted budgets, for the most part, this  
8 year here is an aberration because we had the \$75  
9 million in disaster assistance that was added to our  
10 budget. That was a one-time cost for six disasters  
11 that occurred over various periods of time. So this  
12 number here, this green number, is actually slightly  
13 below the President's request level. So the pattern  
14 continued.

15 And, you know, whether we go with House or  
16 whether we go with Senate, purple or blue  
17 respectively, will determine whether the pattern  
18 continues in FY '15. More on that in a minute.

19 But you're seeing both an inversion here,  
20 but the big thing obviously that happened was the  
21 financial market collapse and enormous recession that  
22 took place and the new level of politicization of the  
23 deficit over this period of time. So this is our 12  
24 and a half percent loss from slightly over a billion  
25 for the organization as a whole to a level in FY '13

1 of just over \$880 million.

2 So we're hoping this was an enormous period  
3 of correction. We're hoping that to be the floor. We  
4 took some one-time steps to get through that period of  
5 time that you can't replicate year in, year out. And  
6 while there were significant mission impacts, we  
7 didn't full-sale close down any major function. If we  
8 were to continue on this path and we were starting to  
9 have these discussions -- another 5 percent, another 5  
10 percent, another 5 percent -- we'd be in serious  
11 territory as far as the ability to do our fundamental  
12 mission work. So that's hanging in the balance.

13 I do want to note here also the dotted line.  
14 That's deflated dollars. So, if you adjusted for the  
15 inflation effect from 2005 out, the real purchasing  
16 power of the dollar for the economists among us is at  
17 levels that are well below where we were in 2005.  
18 Major growth and mission requirements over this period  
19 of time, buying power lower than it used to be.  
20 That's a fairly easy equation for all of us to see  
21 where it lands you.

22 This is why we keep talking about the new  
23 budget reality. This is why things like cost recovery  
24 are on the agenda for later in our session here. We  
25 need to think not only of creative ways to work across

1 different sectors to get our mission responsibilities  
2 accomplished. We also need to look at new ways to use  
3 assets that are available in other sectors as well.  
4 So that conversation is going to be very significant.

5 I'm going to get into now, having looked at  
6 this history, where we are with the House and Senate  
7 on '15 and what some of the major differences are in  
8 that discussion that's taking place. This discussion  
9 for '15 is quite reminiscent of what we saw in '13 and  
10 '14. I believe there still is a very significant  
11 national debate happening at the broad level with  
12 budget politics and where the appropriate level of  
13 federal spending should be across the board.

14 And there's still a lot of discussion about  
15 whether this is here in FY '13 the relevant reference  
16 point, if you will, for our discussions in '15 or  
17 whether it should be more like '14 or slightly higher.  
18 And that's where you see this difference between the  
19 House here in purple, the 892. They are looking more  
20 towards FY '13 generally speaking, not just for  
21 Fisheries, as the relevant reference point for  
22 benchmarking budgetary growth. And the Senate doesn't  
23 have that constraint in their thinking so much. So  
24 we'll get into some of the details of this in a  
25 second.

1 Overall, you all may have seen where things  
2 played out in the discussion of '15. We came really,  
3 really close. The committee chairs pushed hard,  
4 really hard, Mikulski in particular, to get approps  
5 bills through the process and came very close but then  
6 had to table the discussion.

7 So that did result in marks, in committee  
8 marks and language that's very instructive for us.  
9 We've learned a lot from what went into both the  
10 numbers and some of the thinking in the report  
11 language. But we don't have a budget. So for now a  
12 continuing resolution has been put forward. It's  
13 awaiting the President's signature that will take us  
14 out under the terms of a CR until December.

15 There's a big debate about whether it should  
16 be December or later. This is right after midterms.  
17 This is a lame duck period, so it's quite unknown at  
18 this point, pending the electoral outcome, what the  
19 composition of Congress is going to look like and as a  
20 consequence what their position to move on the  
21 appropriations bills will look like.

22 So it's not out of the realm of the likely  
23 that we would end up with a CR for considerably longer  
24 than December. And we just won't know that until  
25 after the midterms, and we probably won't know that

1 after the midterms either because a lot of shaking out  
2 has to happen at that time with committee  
3 representation and all sorts of other things, not to  
4 mention the overall balance of power between the  
5 parties in both chambers. So that's a significant  
6 reality that we're facing.

7 In the meantime, we have the House and the  
8 Senate marks to go on. A couple of slides to provide  
9 an overview of those marks and where they differ,  
10 again, largely reflecting I think debates over the  
11 last few years about our overall budget and policy  
12 context.

13 So the House passed their bill on May 30.  
14 This is a \$5.3 billion mark for all of NOAA, well  
15 below the President's request levels, slightly above  
16 FY '14 for the organization as a whole. The big thing  
17 here, as continues to be the case when you look at the  
18 House big picture, Senate big picture, the House is  
19 very strongly focused on our atmospheric forecasting  
20 and prediction functions, and they have a tendency to  
21 fully fund those and then look at everything else  
22 next.

23 For those of you who remember the sort of  
24 dark days of FY '13, there were remarks from members  
25 of the House Appropriations Committee, we will fund

1 the Weather Service. Everything else is on the table.  
2 And some of the thinking still seems to reflect some  
3 reverberation of that basic strategic statement.

4 So it does fund the Weather Service  
5 operations not just at but above the President's  
6 request level. This is the Weather Service plus the  
7 satellite recapitalization efforts that are needed  
8 that gets funded out of our National Environmental  
9 Satellite Data and Information Service, NESDIS. So  
10 those two pieces are driving the budget in substantial  
11 measure on what people often call the dry side, and  
12 the big pieces there on the recapitalization are the  
13 joint polar satellite and our geostationary  
14 operational environmental satellite recapitalization  
15 effort.

16 Very, very big ticket things, central to the  
17 nation, central not just to NOAA. These are national  
18 observing system assets. They happen to be in our  
19 budget, and when they go up, they have a lot of elbow  
20 room, and that creates some challenges when you're  
21 looking at the sort of top-level pressure on the  
22 budget that all of us are well aware of and it was  
23 evident in that last budget chart that I pointed out.

24 Programmatically, the House and Senate also  
25 have some different views on our portfolio. Just a

1 couple of highlights here, and then I'm going to show  
2 you a table that gets one more level of detail.

3 The Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund has  
4 been a bit of a hot potato in the budget discussions.  
5 It's a large grant program that you know was centered  
6 on West Coast salmon recovery efforts long term. And  
7 during the course of this budget pressure period, that  
8 grant program has proposed at various levels.  
9 Congress has in recent years restored it. The House  
10 did that again. They put it in at \$15 million above  
11 the President's request level. So the President's  
12 budget proposed 50. They funded it at 65 in the House  
13 mark for '15.

14 This is also, this is really technocratic  
15 but very significant. We are trying to get language  
16 in our appropriations bill that gives us the same  
17 authority as other agencies have, such as the  
18 Department of Interior, to accept funds from any other  
19 organization, including private entities, nonprofit  
20 organizations with whom we work already to varying  
21 degrees, as well as private corporations and corporate  
22 interests.

23 This can be done in ways that make great  
24 sense from the vantage point of the mission  
25 requirements of the Agency. These are public outputs



1       that industry often has interest in seeing generated,  
2       and they are willing to fund a lot of activities of  
3       ours. We don't have the authority to do that.

4               So we worked with the Administration. We  
5       have strong Administration support for this. And the  
6       language that came through in both the House and  
7       Senate does not include the phrase "other private  
8       entities," "any other private entities." So we have  
9       authority right now in our legal reading or at least  
10      proposed authority in these marks to accept funds from  
11      anything other than private corporate interests. And  
12      we're concerned about that.

13             I was just talking with OMB about this  
14      yesterday. We're going to continue to try to seek  
15      clarification from Congress to address concerns that  
16      they may have. We believe that there may be concerns  
17      that are understandable but unfounded in terms of how  
18      this could get executed. It's not going to crowd out  
19      funds that could go to academe, that could go to other  
20      research organizations. And I think that's where some  
21      of the concern is.

22             But we'll try to figure it out. I wanted to  
23      draw it to your attention because it could have a  
24      great deal of significance on how we're able to  
25      operate in the future. Yes. Yes, quite. So that's

1 in the weeds but significant.

2 And the bigger thing that stands out in  
3 terms of the numbers is the House knocked back our  
4 habitat funding line hugely, and it pretty much zeroes  
5 funding for community-based restoration, for habitat  
6 restoration. These are grant funds that go out to  
7 state and other local nonprofit, other habitat  
8 restoration efforts. We've got a great track record  
9 in this territory. We're not real sure and need to  
10 learn a little bit more about intent there, but that  
11 was a major programmatic signal in the numbers  
12 themselves. We'll get to the Senate version of this  
13 in just a second.

14 So backing up to the big picture on the  
15 Senate, this is where you can see a difference in  
16 their overall strategy, funding a little bit less so  
17 than the House under the request level of FY '15 at  
18 5.4 but above the FY '14 level. And here you see  
19 explicit attention in the language and in the numbers  
20 to balance across the Ocean Coastal Weather Programs.  
21 At NOAA and in the Administration, we try to avoid the  
22 overly stylized debates about wet side versus dry  
23 side. This is all part of an integrated, earth-  
24 observing prediction and management agency.

25 It should not be one against the other, but

1     what is the best way to keep this entire complex  
2     machinery moving forward? The Senate is concerned  
3     that we're sacrificing the ocean coastal portfolio for  
4     the weather portfolio to some measure. So they're  
5     urging balance here more so than has been they think  
6     the case in recent budget years.

7             They support the Weather Service request as  
8     well. It's not take money from that and put it  
9     somewhere else. It's that these are all high-profile,  
10    very urgent national needs. We should not be  
11    degrading one to support the other. We should be  
12    pushing the whole thing forward. This is the big, big  
13    \$64 trillion question for the federal program  
14    portfolio all together is what portions should grow,  
15    what portions should hold. And that's a very, very  
16    difficult, high-level policy discussion to have, as  
17    you all well understand.

18            So greater support for wet side proposals.  
19    Fisheries funded at 91.5, so this is just below the  
20    President's FY '15 level, 3.3 percent above FY '14. I  
21    didn't emphasize this with the House mark here, but  
22    this is 2.8 percent below FY '14. So this level  
23    proposed to the House for operations, research, and  
24    facilities funding, 790, that's pushing us back closer  
25    to FY '13 levels. It would be very, very difficult

1       for us to execute that. And the Senate puts us in a  
2       different position slightly above FY '14. That gives  
3       us a bit more breathing room given the complexity and  
4       the scope of our operations.

5               So the Senate also sent some similar notes,  
6       likewise support \$65 million for Pacific Coastal  
7       Salmon Recovery Fund. This is a bicameral,  
8       bipartisan, at least on the West Coast supported  
9       program, and that's where that landed. It also has  
10      the same gap in this technical language that the House  
11      has, so we need to talk to both sides.

12             But they came out in a very different place  
13      on our habitat funding. They actually funded it well  
14      above the President's request as well as above our  
15      spend plan. And so you have nearly \$31 million for  
16      habitat restoration relative to zero on the House  
17      side. So that's programmatically one of the starkest  
18      differences between the two.

19             There are some other areas too which I'll  
20      get to in a minute as we walk through this table.  
21      This should be available. I don't know if this has  
22      been posted yet, being posted.

23             MS. LOVETT: We can put it up.

24             MR. DOREMUS: Will be posted? You'll be  
25      able to see this. This is broadly available

1 information. It's all public. And it allows us to  
2 see I think one level of detail, if you'll indulge me  
3 getting into that, one level of detail further so you  
4 can understand a little bit more about what has  
5 changed over time, where we are today, and where the  
6 House and Senate would like to take us in their  
7 different views.

8           So, when you're scanning this, this breaks  
9 our budget down into what's called subactivities, so  
10 these are the major pieces of our mission: protected  
11 resources, fisheries research and management. So  
12 those two are the core funding for our sustainable  
13 fisheries and our protected resources mission,  
14 research and management. We also have enforcement and  
15 observers and then our habitat conservation and  
16 restoration lines.

17           There's a range of different programs and  
18 other activities supporting fisheries. This is a  
19 smaller set of activities, everything from climate and  
20 marine ecosystems and aquaculture to our regional  
21 studies line, which funds Chesapeake Bay and CMAP.  
22 It's a variety of different things. Kind of hard to  
23 give it a single tagline. It's PR support, fisheries  
24 research and management support, a range of different  
25 things.

1           So I'm going to focus on these top four.  
2       This is 90-ish percent of our budget when you add it  
3       all up. All of these activities, these top four are  
4       85-plus percent. And to show you the difference  
5       between where we were in '11, the thing to eyeball  
6       here is '11 versus what we executed this year in '14.  
7       And what you see is sort of a valley effect, so we  
8       went down, down, down, back up, across the board. And  
9       you can see as you eyeball these numbers how steep  
10      that valley is or how deep that valley is. It varies  
11      by each of these areas.

12           So, in protected resources, from FY '10, if  
13      we had that column here, PR dropped nearly 20 percent  
14      from '10 to '13. Fisheries and research management  
15      dropped only 5.6 percent. Our enforcement and  
16      observers is similarly low, single-digit decline.  
17      Habitat conservation and restoration declined by  
18      nearly 30 percent. It was 28.8 if I remember  
19      correctly.

20           So there is a very different effect across  
21      our major activities of the budget decline. It was  
22      taken out of different areas that reflect thinking on  
23      the part of ultimately the appropriators on which  
24      portions of our mission would need to come off first  
25      as you face a budget decline that steep.

1           So we're seeing growth back in '14, so you  
2    see how steep this was in different areas. We're  
3    seeing growth back in '14. The request level across  
4    the board brings us further on this recovery path out  
5    of the woods of FY '13. But the House mark and Senate  
6    mark, as I've been mentioning, would step us either  
7    forward or back to different degrees. And you can  
8    look at this number here as kind of an inflection  
9    either continued up in the case of the Senate for the  
10   most part supporting the 2015 request. When you  
11   eyeball those numbers, they're very similar across the  
12   board. And then the House mark, looking much more  
13   like pre-FY '14 levels.

14           So these numbers here across the board are  
15   below where we are today. So the Senate supporting  
16   growth. The House is supporting a pushback below  
17   where we're executing today, and that's one of the  
18   major messages in this trend line here from '11 to  
19   '15. You'll also see differences by program, which I  
20   think are significant across the board as you look  
21   across this.

22           One thing that we have been fortunate for,  
23   and I always want to emphasize, particularly with this  
24   engagement notion in mind, generally speaking,  
25   throughout this process, some of our core fisheries

1 research functions -- observers, enforcement, stock  
2 assessment funding -- has been stable throughout, as  
3 stable as you could possibly expect throughout this  
4 period of time. We've also had relative stability in  
5 some of the contributing functions to that, in  
6 particular our council and commission funding line,  
7 which held out until last year in terms of -- or until  
8 FY '13, I'm sorry -- in terms of its top-level funding  
9 line.

10 So there are areas, very significant parts  
11 of our budget do not take it for granted, that  
12 continue to remain strongly supported by the  
13 Administration, by the House, by the Senate, both  
14 parties, and that we're quite grateful for.

15 Other parts of our budget are a little bit  
16 more uncertain and reflect broader policy debates, and  
17 those really are more in these areas that have seen  
18 more substantial decline, particularly habitat,  
19 conservation and restoration where you see the  
20 starkest difference in percentage terms between the  
21 House and Senate, 30 versus nearly \$50 million marks  
22 in the case of FY '15. So that's one of the areas  
23 where we expect to see continued debate.

24 One of our strategies, you'll see this very  
25 loudly when you read our priorities document. Eileen



1 referred to this earlier. We are pulling together  
2 across Fisheries and across NOS and other portions of  
3 NOAA to have a concentrated partnership-driven habitat  
4 strategy that centers on our core mission needs. So  
5 it centers on habitat restoration for sustainable  
6 fisheries, essential fish habitat as a dominant link  
7 there, as well as for habitat conditions needed for  
8 the conservation and recovery of protected species.

9 So we have a very strong mission focus, and  
10 we are looking at ways to basically get the greatest  
11 bang for the limited federal dollar that we can put on  
12 it through partnership-driven efforts where our  
13 external partners are able to bring a greater share of  
14 the resource and programmatic heft into the picture.  
15 And we use our science and our concentrating  
16 capability to make sure that those resources are put  
17 in the highest value places.

18 So that in a nutshell is our habitat  
19 strategy, and we hope by pursuing that to have less of  
20 this kind of stark difference in views and seeing  
21 habitat as a third or a tertiary program area when it  
22 is actually central to the long-term mission outcomes  
23 that we're trying to get in sustainable fisheries and  
24 protected resources. So that's a key part of our  
25 strategy there that you'll be hearing as we go.

1           So not all is mixed and generally downside  
2 management news. We do have one really nice piece of  
3 good news in our budget. After a couple of dry years,  
4 we have a very substantial Saltonstall-Kennedy grant  
5 program to administer in FY '14 and we anticipate FY  
6 '15. '11 and '12, there were no resources provided by  
7 Congress for this program. This is a competitive  
8 grant program, a combination of national and regional.

9           And when this resource was turned back on in  
10 '13, we pushed over 90 percent of this out into the  
11 regions. Before it was closer to 40/60, 50/50. And  
12 we anticipate doing that again. Our approp for '13  
13 came in so late that we had to execute the '13 money  
14 in '14. Our '14 approp came in so late that we have  
15 decided to merge the '14 and '15 programs into one  
16 large grant solicitation. Then we hope to be on track  
17 timingwise for what we hope to be continued support by  
18 Congress for this grant program.

19           We are also this year stepping back. We  
20 didn't have time to do this in '13. In '13, we  
21 basically revisited priorities, areas that had been  
22 used for the Saltonstall-Kennedy funding in the past.  
23 We added a territorial emphasis where we were aware  
24 that there was a great deal of challenge with the  
25 territories at lower levels being able to put in

1 competitive programs, so we created a focus area  
2 there. That was the only change in FY '13.

3 And with our own thinking and with our work  
4 with the councils and commissions and with also  
5 direction from Congress, we are stepping back and  
6 looking at our priorities and trying to make them more  
7 regionally driven. As we always say, we are a  
8 regionally driven organization as a whole. Our  
9 mission areas reflect that, and SK should reflect it  
10 as well. So our funding focus areas, we're trying to  
11 get that element into them.

12 And right now we developed internally  
13 looking at -- I keep hitting the wrong button -- we  
14 looked at our priorities document for national  
15 priorities, and then we looked very closely at the  
16 research associated with our cooperative research and  
17 bycatch grant programs, as well, and this is where our  
18 dominant emphasis was, on the Council's five-year  
19 research plans and the research plans associated with  
20 each of the three commissions and used those to put  
21 together a proposal that is now under review by the  
22 council and commission community before solicitation  
23 we hope early next month.

24 So we're pushing that forward. It's very  
25 exciting. This could be between a 15 and \$20 million

1 grant program, a substantial number. And for all  
2 those grant programs that more or less got crushed in  
3 the dropoff, that budgetary dropoff up to '13 and  
4 including '13, this does provide some welcome relief  
5 to the grant community in the regions. So we're quite  
6 pleased to have that.

7 CR coming forward. I already mentioned it.  
8 Slight reduction from the current level, so that would  
9 put us at about a half million less than what we  
10 executed for '14. And it's substantially below where  
11 we want to be, with the President's request level  
12 about \$25 million below that. And we'll see where we  
13 end up in December, as I already alluded to.

14 So last couple of notes here before going  
15 back to the program portfolio review for the  
16 committee, and this is on the engagement piece that I  
17 mentioned earlier. I think this is rudimentary, but  
18 it gives you a sense of the complexity of the budget  
19 cycle. And as I emphasized in our discussion with the  
20 state directors, as you know, a substantial portion of  
21 this, pretty much the whole front half between the  
22 direction that we get from the Administration and from  
23 the Department and the issuance initially to the  
24 Department of the NOAA budget proposal and then the  
25 submission of that proposal into ultimately DoC's

1 submission first to the Department, then to DoC where  
2 we are today, all of this is administratively  
3 confidential.

4 So we rely as we go through this on  
5 direction from the Administration as well as our  
6 priorities in our engagement with the committee and  
7 with others in the development of those priorities.  
8 We use those to guide the input to this process. So  
9 I'll get to that in a minute, the sort of strategic  
10 guidance to the budget cycle.

11 And then there's the public debate process,  
12 semi-public debate process. The budget gets submitted  
13 by the President typically early in February. In  
14 recent years it hasn't been at that time. And then  
15 there's the congressional decision-making cycle and  
16 ultimately an appropriation passed theoretically in  
17 September. That also hasn't happened of late. And  
18 then we have a full year to execute, which also hasn't  
19 happened of late.

20 But this piece of the budget is where more  
21 of the opportunity to engage with Congress on the  
22 implications of different funding levels comes into  
23 play. So right now we are finishing out '14. We just  
24 delivered our budget. We had our briefing with OMB  
25 literally yesterday on our FY '16. And we are about

1 to convene in early November our Leadership Council to  
2 discuss our options for FY '17, and that'll draw from  
3 some of our engagement formally with some of our key  
4 partners.

5 We had made commitments recently, and I hope  
6 that Randy and David can speak to this a little bit.  
7 Eileen and the leadership team made commitments to  
8 receive input at the regional level from state  
9 directors, at the national level from the commissions  
10 into that front end view. And we look forward to  
11 continued, and from my vantage in particular,  
12 continued engagement with the commission directors at  
13 the sort of aggregate regional level and national  
14 level as we look at how the budget picture is evolving  
15 and we seek to make sure that those who are making  
16 decisions about our budget understand the full  
17 implications of different funding levels for everybody  
18 who has stakes in what we do and what we fund.

19 So there are some changes coming forward  
20 there in terms of how we work. And this is just a  
21 schematic that shows multiple years. This is the  
22 cycle in any given budget. This is multiple years.  
23 So we're sitting here right now in September of 2014.  
24 Markups took place. We're under a CR. We're hoping  
25 to get direction for execution as we start the fiscal

1 year October 1.

2 The PB is under deliberation by OMB right  
3 now for '16. This is Fiscal Year '16. And '17, we're  
4 in the front end of that. We typically submit our  
5 budget proposals to the Department in the spring. So  
6 that is where we are at any given point in time.  
7 These pieces, the green pieces, when congressional  
8 deliberations are taking place are publicly  
9 accessible. The front end of this is only to the  
10 extent that there's participation in programmatic  
11 planning processes, like the development of our  
12 priorities and our long-term strategic statements.

13 So that's where we stand on the engagement  
14 piece. And back to my more general point, there's  
15 engagement in budget, there's engagement in program  
16 delivery, and I think both of those things have a  
17 significant context for the work of the committee  
18 going forward. And we have put some thought, and our  
19 whole agenda in fact is structured around the  
20 potential work agenda for the committee, the sort of  
21 portfolio of issues that we think the committee,  
22 having consulted with many of you and with the Chair  
23 in particular, is well positioned to assist us with.  
24 And we wanted to provide a substantial opportunity  
25 this morning to really throw that open given where we

1 are, the landscape of our budget, our policy  
2 environment, the history of work that you all have  
3 contributed to, and the major programmatic threads  
4 that we think a continued focus by the committee might  
5 be very advantageous to us.

6 So that is the broad picture, and I think  
7 I'll take the baton back to Eileen for a quick look at  
8 where we are or where our priorities are, or do you  
9 want to take a break at this point?

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Let's take a 15-minute  
11 break. So it's 10:15. Let's take a 15-minute break  
12 until 10:30. Thanks, everybody.

13 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Could we  
15 reconvene, please? Thanks, everybody. You know, in  
16 light of the last two presentations we had, I just  
17 wanted to make the observation that both NOAA and all  
18 of us as stakeholders are fortunate to have Eileen as  
19 the assistant administrator and Paul as the deputy  
20 assistant. You know, they've both demonstrated off-  
21 the-cuff sometimes, you know. They had their notes,  
22 and then they just went totally off the cuff. The  
23 depth of their knowledge, the clarity that they can  
24 convey so quickly, you know, I'm very impressed. I've  
25 had obviously over the last few years the opportunity



1 to work with both of them, and I'm really excited  
2 about the leadership.

3 I'm also grateful for all the leadership  
4 that we've had over the last few years. Sam, your  
5 help has been tremendous. Alan, who I guess isn't  
6 here today. And then our state committee advisors  
7 that we'll be hearing from later today, Randy Fisher,  
8 Bob Beal, David Donaldson, and his predecessor, Larry  
9 Simpson. You guys have all been, you know, tremendous  
10 advisors to MAFAC. And I think we're making success  
11 here as a body, and it's sort of a mutual thing where  
12 we're helping NOAA and they're helping us.

13 And I want to just take a moment and look  
14 back for a second because over the last few years we  
15 have as a body accomplished quite a bit. And I was  
16 going through the last set of meetings, and I realized  
17 that there are eight major categories of documents  
18 that our committee has generated. We updated Vision  
19 2020. We put out multiple documents on the Magnuson  
20 reauthorization. We did the sustainability seafood  
21 certification. We did an ESA implementation document.  
22 We had major commentary on recreational fishing policy  
23 and on aquaculture policy. We contributed to the  
24 Managing Our Nation's Fisheries III conference and how  
25 that was shaped, and then National Standard I

1 Rulemaking, eight major contributions by our  
2 committee.

3 And I'm really pleased by how much we've  
4 accomplished, and it's because everybody in this room  
5 played a role. Each of us as stakeholders has a set  
6 of niche expertise, and our authority and influence as  
7 a body, as the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee, is  
8 based on our ability to cooperate together and to  
9 bring all of our collective knowledge into a single,  
10 well-thought out recommendation.

11 And I appreciate the fact that we represent  
12 different perspectives and we don't always agree, but  
13 that's part of the process too. When we are able to  
14 codify our disagreements and the key points of  
15 disagreement and then transmit that back to NOAA, it  
16 helps them and informs them and helps them make better  
17 policy decisions.

18 I have also been pleased by how we've  
19 developed a process of doing these documents over  
20 time. I think as a group we are using our meetings  
21 very effectively. We're having discussions in this  
22 room. We go off and at dinner we're still having  
23 conversations about things. And then we're using the  
24 momentum that we develop to go back to develop  
25 documents, to refine them. And it's been making our

1 telephone conferences very effective.

2 And, you know, I appreciate the fact that we  
3 don't have as many meetings as we used to. The  
4 funding isn't what it used to be. And yet we're still  
5 generating these documents and increasing our output  
6 in a time of decreasing budgets. And I want to give  
7 some very special acknowledgment to all my  
8 subcommittee chairs. I really think you guys have  
9 been the backbone of what we've accomplished. So  
10 George Nardi and Julie Morris and Tony Chatwin and  
11 Dave Wallace and Ken Franke. I'm really grateful to  
12 all of you for your leadership in the subcommittees.

13 Over the course of the next year that I have  
14 left as Chair, I'm hoping that we can continue this  
15 process, and I'm really hopeful that all of you will  
16 continue to help. And what we're going to do for the  
17 next few minutes this morning is talk about what's  
18 ahead in the next year, and then we have an item that  
19 got tabled in the discussion of depleted versus  
20 overfished that we need to double back to, and then  
21 we'll move on with the rest of the agenda. But I'm  
22 going to turn it over to Eileen. Thanks.

23 MS. SOBECK: Great. Thanks, everybody. So  
24 I wanted to move to just kind of introduce the topics  
25 that you're going to be hearing some more detailed

1 presentations on the rest of the meeting, which is,  
2 you know, some suggested areas for you all to focus  
3 your efforts on in the next year or so.

4 And as we've all mentioned, since we  
5 consider this to be a very useful committee and take  
6 your input really seriously, we've actually given some  
7 serious thought over the past few months about where  
8 your input, where we think it could be really helpful.  
9 And, you know, this is just a set of suggestions, but  
10 it is a set of suggestions that has been based on a  
11 lot of discussion with Paul and Sam in our policy  
12 office, with Keith. And all of these I think you'll  
13 see based on the remarks that Paul and I have made are  
14 areas where we see some significant both opportunities  
15 and challenges for NMFS in the next year or so.

16 And so it's not as if we've looked for  
17 little cul-de-sacs where you guys can be pigeonholed  
18 and not useful. These are some of the issues where we  
19 see a lot of our time and energy being focused and  
20 where we see sort of potential significant changes in  
21 either direction or emphasis. And so I think, you  
22 know, you have the opportunity to weigh in and be part  
23 of where we end up on all of these issues.

24 So it should be no surprise based on the  
25 agenda that these issues involve climate change,

1 recovering species, and aquaculture. So all of these,  
2 you know, I think are areas where there's really a  
3 huge need for collaborative effort for reaching really  
4 deeply into all of our group's partners, stakeholders,  
5 appropriators, you know, congressional partners, state  
6 partners, councils. If we're going to develop a way  
7 forward and a strategy and priorities within all three  
8 of these areas, we're going to really need to reach  
9 into all of those communities to figure out what kind  
10 of guidance and information and advice we can get.

11 So this is a great week to talk about  
12 climate because of, you know, the climate change  
13 conference going on at the UN in New York, a bunch of  
14 marches around the country. So we are right on point  
15 dealing with climate here at MAFAC.

16 Ocean systems are changing big time. Ocean  
17 temperatures are rising, as is sea level. Ocean  
18 acidification is changing. Fish populations are  
19 shifting. Coral reef populations are at risk. These  
20 issues were noted in the Vision 2020 report that you  
21 guys put together. The President has a new climate  
22 action plan out.

23 How does that all relate to our Agency's  
24 mission of promoting sustainable fisheries and to the  
25 future and recovering protected resources? We know

1       there are a lot of unanswered questions out there. We  
2       have to deal with new issues, new information. We  
3       need to adapt our management. It isn't really just  
4       about where are fish today. It's where are fish going  
5       to be in the future. Are there going to be fish in  
6       the future? Are there going to be coastal communities  
7       with the ability to support fishing in the future?  
8       Those are all highly relevant questions that are  
9       related to climate change.

10               And we need to increase our engagement with  
11       stakeholders and partners on this issue. We want to  
12       improve resilience at all of the levels I talked about  
13       before: ecological, economic, and community  
14       resilience. We need to address risks to marine  
15       resources and the consequent risks to coastal  
16       communities and the economic benefits that they rely  
17       on and the people who depend on them.

18               So I think one thing we want to put on the  
19       table for you all to discuss during the course of this  
20       meeting is to consider establishing a new working  
21       group to be a conduit for stakeholder input as you  
22       have on many other important issues and to provide  
23       advice on the production, delivery, and use of  
24       climate-related information to fulfill the NMFS-  
25       specific mission. Obviously climate change issues

1       affect a number of NOAA lines, not just the National  
2       Marine Fisheries Service, but that's what we're  
3       looking for advice on.

4               Dr. Richard Merrick, who's our chief  
5       scientist who's meeting with the heads of all of our  
6       science labs this week so isn't here, has ensured that  
7       we're getting good input from the scientific community  
8       through the Science Advisory Board. But we really  
9       haven't gotten similar advice through this body or  
10      anything like it. And we feel like the time has come  
11      that we need to make sure that we are getting input  
12      from all of you, all of the communities that you  
13      represent, and that we fill any gaps that might exist  
14      out there as we move forward.

15             So we're going to be -- I forget. Is it  
16      this afternoon? Roger will come in right after lunch,  
17      is going to help. He's our fisheries climate change  
18      coordinator. He is really kind of the guru of all  
19      things climate at the moment in the Fisheries Service,  
20      and he's going to give you I think a great overview of  
21      what we are doing, what directions we're going at the  
22      moment, and make some suggestions about the role that  
23      he sees might be beneficial for our Agency, for MAFAC  
24      to fill. So that's number one, climate.

25             Number two, recovery planning. As the

1 recent Protected Resources Subcommittee has noted,  
2 listing species as threatened or endangered is only  
3 half the equation. And if we want to sustain healthy  
4 marine resources, we've got to take species that are  
5 on the list and get them recovered and off the list  
6 and get them to healthy population levels to support  
7 the overall ecosystem.

8 And Donna Wieting, who's sitting here in the  
9 back, is going to talk to you about this. I think  
10 this is something that Donna, when she took over  
11 leadership about a year ago --

12 MS. WIETING: A little over a year now.

13 MS. SOBECK: A little over a year ago,  
14 Protected Resources, that we've tasked her with  
15 thinking about. And I've seen this at the Fish and  
16 Wildlife Service too, that the Endangered Species Act  
17 listing petitioning process is a citizen tool for  
18 being involved in the federal process and one that has  
19 been a well-used tool by the outside world. And we've  
20 really sometimes been at the mercy, let our programs  
21 be driven by the listing process.

22 We've actually been pretty consumed here  
23 recently at NMFS -- you guys might know -- dealing  
24 with a petition to list potentially 80-plus species of  
25 coral as threatened or endangered, and we had a huge



1 dedication of resources over the past few years to  
2 come up with a proposed listing and then just  
3 recently, about a month ago, a final listing process  
4 where we determined that 20 new species of coral would  
5 be added to the list as threatened. There are already  
6 two species, two threatened species on the list, so  
7 that will have seven species of coral listed as  
8 threatened in the Caribbean Gulf area, Florida  
9 Caribbean Gulf area, and then 15 species in the  
10 Greater Pacific area.

11 Again, it puts an additional burden, a new  
12 type of protected resource in sort of new areas for us  
13 to plan around. It will add to our consultation  
14 burden. But we need to look beyond the listing  
15 process. How do we get species recovered? How do we  
16 prioritize our recovery actions? What has worked?  
17 What hasn't worked? Why haven't particular recovery  
18 actions worked? Who haven't we engaged?

19 We all know that recovery planning or  
20 implementation is not a federal only responsibility,  
21 that it can only be done in partnership with lots of  
22 different entities. And I think that we are all  
23 committed here in leadership and under Donna's  
24 leadership in Protected Resources to spend some Agency  
25 time thinking about that recovery process and how to

1 recognize how to get there and when we get there and  
2 when we get there to get species delisted and  
3 recognized, that there are some species, you know,  
4 some large cetacean species that were on the list from  
5 the very beginning because of commercial whaling  
6 pressures. Those pressures are gone now for the most  
7 part. And recognize that we actually have some  
8 successes in these areas because that's what we've  
9 been asked to do. What have we spent our time and  
10 money working on?

11 We think there are some successes out there  
12 that can be recognized, number one. We think that  
13 there are some areas where with some identification  
14 and prioritization of some recovery actions that we  
15 might be able to actually get to recovery. We can't  
16 do everything for every species, so what should we be  
17 concentrating on? What has worked? What hasn't  
18 worked?

19 We could really use your help in this area.  
20 I think there is work to be done, and we are committed  
21 to do it, and we're looking for a wise way to do that.  
22 So Donna is going to present some additional detail  
23 and some ideas that we have on that front and some  
24 ideas for where input from your standing committee  
25 would be useful.

1           And then the third area of emphasis that  
2       we're focused on is aquaculture. I think that we  
3       realize that this group has been prescient about  
4       aquaculture and has long recognized the potential for  
5       the development of responsible aquaculture, and we'd  
6       like to pull on that in a more active way now. Again,  
7       I think that some thoughtful input from this group and  
8       the constituents that you represent and the Agency in  
9       how we plan to go forward with aquaculture could  
10      really make a difference here.

11           As Paul pointed out, there are some very  
12      different views among our appropriators about how to  
13      think about aquaculture. There are some really  
14      interesting developments in aquaculture that you'll  
15      hear about from Mike Rubino. We have a proposed rule  
16      out in the Gulf that would open the way for  
17      aquaculture in federal waters. We've had some very  
18      thoughtful approaches to how to streamline and make  
19      aquaculture permitting more efficient and easier for  
20      proponents in conjunction with various states.

21           We'd like to sort of present where we are  
22      and get advice from you all about how to move that  
23      forward in the most appropriate way. I think, again,  
24      we're at the cusp of, are we going to move forward?  
25      Are we going to be leaders, or are we just going to

1 kind of have another underfunded effort where we don't  
2 really have a plan and it just proceeds piecemeal?

3 So those I think are the areas that we think  
4 that your input can be potentially most effective, and  
5 we hope that you'll kind of keep an open mind about  
6 those, listen to the presentations that will give you  
7 kind of the background and our most thoughtful views  
8 about where MAFAC recommendations' point of entry  
9 would be most useful to us.

10 So those are spread out over the next two  
11 days I think. And, you know, I look forward to  
12 hearing feedback about that. I'll be at the happy  
13 hour this evening for a while. I think you guys are  
14 all invited too. I'm going to try to pop in the last  
15 morning and hear your report outs. I've got some  
16 other stuff I have to attend to for this afternoon and  
17 tomorrow morning, but I'm going to be very interested  
18 in the read outs. And we always get good reports, and  
19 Keith and I will talk on a regular basis.

20 So those are the outlines of where we think  
21 the path forward for you all might be.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Do we have  
23 commentary from any of the members? Tony?

24 MR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And  
25 thank you, Eileen and Paul. So the commentary request

1 offer is all inclusive, like to the presentations  
2 prior to this or on this particular --

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

4 MR. CHATWIN: Okay. Yeah, because mine is  
5 with regard to the presentations. And I'd like to  
6 thank you both for the excellent overview and then  
7 diving deeper into the budget process. I really  
8 appreciate that.

9 One question I had was regarding the  
10 Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant Program. I'm delighted to  
11 hear, and I'm sure my colleagues around the table  
12 share this delight with me, that that's being funded  
13 again and that the hope is that that will be a  
14 recurring event.

15 I think in thinking of the next round, FY  
16 '16, I think there will be an opportunity if you so  
17 desire to get some input from MAFAC on what some of  
18 the priorities in that request for proposals may be,  
19 and I think it could mutually beneficial. I think  
20 we've been struggling as a body to find the right way  
21 to produce budget advice that reflects our priorities,  
22 and it seems to me that this program in particular is  
23 an opportunity to do that at a more manageable scale  
24 where we could look at how the upcoming request for  
25 proposals is framed and see whether there are some

1 areas that with slight tweaks could advance some of  
2 the recommendations that this body has made over the  
3 past few years. So thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So Eileen whispered in  
5 my ear that there's not a whole lot of time before the  
6 two-year grant cycle is under way. So I think --

7 MS. SOBECK: Paul could speak to that.

8 MR. CHATWIN: I mean going forward.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Right, but one thing is  
10 our Strategic Planning Committee could at least offer  
11 up some initial thoughts on that while we're here over  
12 the next two days. So I'd encourage you to think  
13 about whether or not there's something you can do in  
14 the subcommittee that you could report back to us on  
15 Thursday and offer up some comments in the next 72  
16 hours.

17 MR. DOREMUS: Sure. And thank you very much  
18 for the question, and I think it's a wonderful thought  
19 and would love to work with the committee on how best  
20 to very much move in that direction.

21 As Eileen indicated, we're on this  
22 compressed timeframe for what's right in front of us.  
23 It's a large national competitive grant program.  
24 We're trying to develop it in ways that are sensitive  
25 to regional-specific needs but also have the national

1       programmatic emphases that make sense when you look at  
2       those regional needs collectively.

3               And as I indicated in my presentation, we're  
4       also looking for ways that we can look at our other  
5       major community grant-based programmatic efforts,  
6       bycatch and cooperative research, and look at these  
7       holistically. So I would actually be interested in an  
8       even broader scope of thinking that we could discuss  
9       along those lines as well.

10              But we'd be happy given the length of time  
11       for the solicitation, for the proposal development,  
12       for the proposal review, we had a very compressed  
13       period of time to develop these recharacterized  
14       proposals. But this is just now, and as you indicate,  
15       going forward I think it would be very good to look at  
16       how, and this is part of our thinking, how we can best  
17       use these types of grant programs for our mission  
18       interests and for advancing some of the programmatic  
19       concepts that come out of the committee work. So I  
20       think it's a wonderful suggestion.

21              Over time I think we should be able to do  
22       that. And as Keith indicated, there's no time like  
23       now to start thinking in that direction. We could  
24       provide to you just for your current understanding the  
25       draft that is being reviewed, the draft priority set

1       that's being reviewed so you can get a sense of where  
2       we're pointing with that and have some advance  
3       knowledge of the process.

4               All of you may have ability to reach out  
5       into other communities as well to make sure people are  
6       aware of this. That's always very important. We have  
7       found interestingly a great deal of variation by  
8       region in level of awareness of the funding  
9       opportunity and a variation generally in the scale and  
10      the quality of the proposals. So part of our interest  
11      over time is to balance that out as well.

12             So we'd be happy to provide broader  
13      information on SK, on how the '13 competition worked,  
14      what areas were funded, and then how we're going  
15      forward with '14 so we can move in the direction of  
16      the proposal that you're putting out, which I think is  
17      a very beneficial one, and I'm happy to work with you  
18      in that respect.

19             MS. SOBECK: But, Paul, when are we -- do we  
20      have a timeframe for when we think the solicitation  
21      with its guidance is going out? It's like soon?

22             MR. DOREMUS: Yes. We are on schedule right  
23      now for the solicitation. Once we get input from  
24      councils and commission that's in the process right  
25      now, we will incorporate that. And our goal is to put



1 the solicitation announcement out in early October.  
2 So this is right around the corner. So we're kind of  
3 on rails for --

4 MS. SOBECK: And that's going to cover a  
5 two-year, '15 and '16 grant.

6 MR. DOREMUS: Yes, that's right. '14 and  
7 '15.

8 MS. SOBECK: '14 and '15. '14 and '15  
9 grants. Okay.

10 MR. DOREMUS: So we're going to see the  
11 President's FY '16 budget come forward early in the  
12 year. And I think the earlier we start -- up to this  
13 point in time, with SK having not been on a grant  
14 program for two years and having been a much smaller  
15 grant program years prior, I'd like to get to the  
16 point where we're thinking about it programmatically  
17 far more in advance than after we get the  
18 appropriation. And that's been how we've been doing  
19 things. Get approp, okay, now let's go.

20 So, if we can start thinking about should we  
21 have the availability of this type of resource in the  
22 future, how could we best deploy it earlier starting  
23 now for '16, as I believe you're suggesting, I think  
24 that would be a very good thing. So thank you for  
25 that.

1           MR. CHATWIN: Mr. Chairman, just to not  
2     leave it hanging. My subcommittee would be very happy  
3     to start to look at that. Thank you.

4           CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So I'm looking at the  
5     calendar for tomorrow and already trying to figure out  
6     the planning. We've got cost recovery and then a full  
7     committee discussion, cost recovery discussion during  
8     the 3 to 5 slot tomorrow afternoon. And I'll be happy  
9     to work with you over the next few hours to try to  
10    figure out how we can tweak the schedule to perhaps  
11    add this on to the agenda for the Strategic Planning  
12    Subcommittee. Julie?

13          MS. MORRIS: Thank you both for the time  
14    you're spending with us this morning and the strategic  
15    directions that you're laying out. And I'm hearing a  
16    consistent theme of asking MAFAC to help build  
17    partnerships and collaborations that can get the work  
18    that needs to be done done.

19          So my question is just tell us some of the  
20    ways, some examples of some of the ways that MAFAC  
21    could help build those partnerships and collaborators.  
22    I mean, we can get people to write letters of support.  
23    We can try to find people who could convene task  
24    forces. But, you know, I'm starting to try to  
25    brainstorm, but I'm sure you've already thought about

1       some of these things. So why don't you share with us  
2       some of the mechanisms that you think we might employ  
3       in that area.

4               MS. SOBECK: Well, I don't think it's so  
5       much, you know, here's what we want to do, go out and  
6       find us partners. I think that it's helping us  
7       explore these issues that we know that we're going to  
8       have to develop some actions under or attack or, you  
9       know, deal with and help us reach out to your  
10      communities to figure out how does your community see  
11      the problem. What is the information that your folks  
12      think is relevant, whether it's the fishing community,  
13      an NGO community, a state? Are we considering the  
14      relevant information? What are their concerns?

15             I mean, I think it's like the traceability  
16      certification. You know, what's working well and  
17      what's not working well? What gaps do you all from  
18      your relative points of view see out there? What are  
19      we doing well? What aren't we doing well?

20             You know, I think each of our presenters  
21      will give you some specific, you know, as we get to  
22      the specific, you know, Donna and Roger and Mike  
23      Rubino are going to give you some of the specific  
24      ideas. But, you know, I guess I'm just thinking like  
25      recovery planning, we're going to have some case

1 studies and talk about it and we'll be interested in  
2 your input, what kinds of recovery actions seem from  
3 our point of view to have worked, getting your  
4 perspective on whether that perception is correct or  
5 not or helping us identify, you know, maybe there are  
6 some gaps out there in terms of communities that would  
7 like to participate in certain recovery actions that  
8 we haven't somehow reached out to.

9 So I'm not sure that we're trying to say  
10 that the burden is on you to bring partners and  
11 collaboration to the table. I think we're saying your  
12 input is that collaboration and helps us figure out  
13 whether we are being successful and being  
14 collaborative or not. And so we're looking for the  
15 collaborative thinking. It's not like we're trying to  
16 make assignments to you all, although we're happy to  
17 have you do that as well, but I don't think that's  
18 really our goal. Paul, do you want to elaborate, or  
19 Sam?

20 MR. RAUCH: Maybe I can elaborate a little  
21 bit. I mean, I agree that the actual partnership may  
22 not be the goal, but there are any number of  
23 circumstances where we have been involved in that when  
24 we are dealing with particularly with endangered  
25 species recovery, we get federally minded, federally

1       oriented and we miss the opportunity to find that  
2       there are plenty of good, valuable partners that can  
3       make progress.

4               The example in particular that I am thinking  
5       of is with the critically endangered Hawaiian monk  
6       seal, which is in a downward decline. The Marine  
7       Mammal Commission arranged private funding to help  
8       build a monk seal hospital in Hawaii where they  
9       transport injured monk seals to this hospital and then  
10      they replant them back. We didn't fund that. That  
11      was not a federal issue. We did provide veterinary  
12      services, but that's it.

13             That was a partnership where in essence the  
14      Marine Mammal Commission is not quite an advisory  
15      committee, but it is similar. They went out and  
16      helped us find that partnership and they arranged that  
17      purely through private issues.

18             We've had issues where in the midst of the  
19      oil spill in the Gulf we had to arrange -- we needed  
20      to transport turtles from a beach that was going to be  
21      oiled, did not. We could not on our own get past,  
22      well, the DoD has to do it because they're the only  
23      federal people. But we worked with some private  
24      people or our partners did to arrange I think FedEx to  
25      ship the turtles, which we couldn't get out of our own

1 federal mindset to defederalize the problem.

2 And I think, so it's helping us think about  
3 ways to defederalize these problems and use  
4 partnerships. But also I completely agree with  
5 Eileen. To the extent that you all have connections  
6 that could help us make on these critical issues, we  
7 certainly want to take advantage of those.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Sam, in light of those  
9 comments, I was troubled by Paul's presentation and  
10 the mention of the congressional limitation, no  
11 funding from private sources. That really gives me  
12 some concern, and I'm wondering if we could even or if  
13 we can and should add that issue also -- sorry, Tony,  
14 to pile on to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee --  
15 as something that MAFAC should be commenting on. But  
16 is there anything else you can elaborate on that  
17 point, Paul?

18 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you. I think right now  
19 I'm cautiously optimistic. It wasn't a proscription.  
20 It was the lack of specific authority to do that. I  
21 think it's important for the committee to be aware of  
22 it. I think we're relevant to take note of it.

23 We have the full support of the  
24 Administration, and we anticipate engaging with our  
25 appropriations committees on this. So I'm cautiously

1 optimistic we'll be able to get that language  
2 introduced possibly in FY '15, and I'm sure we will  
3 reintroduce it again in FY '16.

4 So it is at this point something that I  
5 think the awareness and acknowledgment of the value of  
6 having that capability is helpful. But I think we  
7 have a lot of room to go to understand and deal with  
8 whatever concerns are present on behalf of the  
9 appropriators in the current budget cycle I hope.

10 It depends in part on what kind of  
11 negotiations we get into with FY '15, if we end up in  
12 a CR. But we do and already are starting to engage at  
13 the staff level to make sure we understand what their  
14 concerns are. So we could get back to you if we think  
15 additional lift is needed, but right now I think we're  
16 working the system and I think we might get there.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Pam?

18 MS. YOCHAM: There's very strong opposition  
19 to this in the academic community and nonprofit  
20 research community, some very serious concerns that  
21 have been raised, and I think constituents have  
22 brought those to, you know, Congress's attention. So  
23 I'd be happy to, you know, engage in that conversation  
24 and tell you what I know from groups like the National  
25 Association of Marine Labs and other entities, what

1       those concerns are. But there are very, very serious  
2       concerns. So, if we make this a topic of discussion,  
3       I'd be happy to tell you what I know from those  
4       groups.

5               MR. DOREMUS: Thank you very much. We are  
6       aware of those concerns and that they came up late in  
7       the process. We do think that the inability to  
8       actually explain how this would work is contributing  
9       to that. It is not going to put us in a position of  
10      competing for limited federal grant dollars with our  
11      external constituents at all. That's not the intent.

12             We have had to turn away funding that  
13      industry has wanted to provide for specific Arctic  
14      research needs to do baseline ecosystem assessments  
15      that the oil and gas industry needs but we also need  
16      that would be publicly available scientific output  
17      that involves research capabilities that we're in a  
18      distinctive position to provide.

19             But I do much appreciate your willingness to  
20      convey those concerns and to allow us to talk about  
21      how this would work so that we could make sure that it  
22      gets done as we anticipate, which would not involve  
23      any competition for resources as people are concerned  
24      about. So thank you for that. We'll take you up on  
25      it.



1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: George?

2 MR. NARDI: Just a comment. Tony beat me to  
3 the punch, but I just want to make one brief comment  
4 on the SK program. And I too am encouraged to see the  
5 added funding. I can remember years ago the program,  
6 how much good it's done for industry. And over the  
7 years, I just would hope when we consider the thinking  
8 about priorities, I remember we used to refer to the  
9 program as the Saltonstall-Kennedy Industry Grants  
10 Program, and it sort of has drifted over the years.

11 And I just would like to make sure if we are  
12 giving it consideration that the fisheries and  
13 aquaculture industries are also able to weigh in  
14 because that program did do a lot of good back in the  
15 '80s and '90s when I was actively involved in it. And  
16 I've just seen it drift, so I'm hoping that we'll take  
17 that into consideration going forward. Thanks.

18 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you. Well stated.  
19 We're aware of that, and we hope that with the  
20 priorities being reconfigured as they appear to be  
21 going that that'll contribute to what you're talking  
22 about, having a strong industry-centered flavor to  
23 that.

24 There's also a piece of SK that I think  
25 speaks to that. At Congress's direction, they asked

1       for no less than, if I recall correctly, 10 percent of  
2       the resources to go to community-based bridge grant  
3       constructs. And we're trying to learn more about  
4       exactly what that means, but we do believe in the  
5       spirit that you're talking about, these are ways to  
6       work with communities where industry is in transition,  
7       where there's been substantial changes in the  
8       opportunities that they have and to look at ways that  
9       different types of capabilities, whether it's  
10      aquaculture or other sorts of things, could be pursued  
11      to enable the communities to more smoothly transition  
12      as the opportunities, harvesting opportunities  
13      basically evolve as stock conditions change.

14               So that's hardwired in there as well, and I  
15      think it's pushing in the direction you're talking  
16      about.

17               CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Any other member  
18      questions or comments? Randy?

19               MR. FISHER: I was just a little bit  
20      curious, Paul, what your take is on the fact that the  
21      House keeps cutting on habitat money, and I'm  
22      wondering why you think that is or is there a solution  
23      or whatever.

24               MR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Randy. We need to  
25      do more consultation with the House. I think there

1 are a number of factors that could be contributing.  
2 Some of them I alluded to in my discussion. We have  
3 varying degrees, and it takes a while to get this type  
4 of programmatic understanding deeply embedded in our  
5 appropriations community.

6 But I think there are different degrees of  
7 understanding of the role that habitat investments  
8 play in our core mission responsibilities. To put it  
9 in overly stylized and too stark terms, but it comes  
10 down to we want money for stock assessments and not  
11 for, you know, this community habitat thing. We don't  
12 see how that gets us more fish.

13 And that connection I believe is just an  
14 educational opportunity, if you will, and a long-term  
15 one. But I do think people do not see in a ecosystem  
16 sense as we do how habitat investments are central to  
17 long-term sustainability of fishery stocks, and that's  
18 a challenge for us to get that level of understanding  
19 into the communities that are in a position to make  
20 these kind of decisions. That's probably the broadest  
21 driver behind this kind of thinking.

22 A second factor, when you are looking, and  
23 everybody knows this, and it's a challenge in federal  
24 budget management, but when you're looking for places  
25 to cut, very often people do go to grant programs and

1 trim those back, treating them as scalable. In this  
2 instance, the trim was a full-scale cessation of  
3 activity, and I'm not sure fully what the intent is  
4 behind that.

5           There's also, frankly, every mark has some  
6 consideration of how the other chamber is going to  
7 respond. I think very often you see marks that have  
8 expectations that in conference the number will change  
9 implicitly. And I hope that there might be a  
10 dimension of that in this discussion as well. I'm not  
11 sure. That's just speculation, and it's a time-  
12 honored back and forth between the House and the  
13 Senate as they move towards conference how they think  
14 the other side will react to their funding proposal.  
15 So often they'll push in one direction and expect the  
16 middle to be somewhere else.

17           So I think those are probably the three  
18 major things that I see. Eileen may have some other  
19 views.

20           MS. SOBECK: I guess building on the  
21 fundamental stock assessments are important and  
22 nothing else is. I think part of why we're coming to  
23 this group and why we had the discussion we had a  
24 couple months ago at the CCC meeting was if these  
25 other important groups of partners and stakeholders

1 can help us build a foundation of why habitat is  
2 important and is fundamental to sustainable fisheries,  
3 then, you know, that's evidence that we bring into the  
4 budget process to say this isn't just, you know, our  
5 hair-brained habitat folks trying to perpetuate their  
6 own jobs. We're getting feedback from the greater  
7 fisheries community at every level that this is  
8 important fundamental work to the future of  
9 sustainable fisheries or protected resources.

10 And, you know, we had an interesting  
11 conversation at the CCC meeting where the councils  
12 kind of said, well, why should we spend any time  
13 thinking about or saying things or putting in some  
14 way, shape, or form stuff about habitat into fishery  
15 management plans or discussing it in our council  
16 meetings because we don't really have kind of dominion  
17 over that. That's not going to be part of our  
18 regulatory responsibility.

19 And I think, you know, our response was,  
20 yeah, but, you know, you're the experts on what's  
21 important to fisheries, and if you make statements  
22 about the importance of habitat and about your  
23 frustration about not being able to necessarily affect  
24 habitat, we can take those views, those expert views  
25 of our partners, our really important partners, and

1 take them to the right places and say we can't do  
2 everything in the council world, in the Magnuson Act  
3 world, you know, but it is a fundamental building  
4 block to the future of sustainable fisheries.

5 So, I mean, I think part of it is  
6 congressional gamesmanship, but I think part of it is  
7 telling the fundamental story in a better way and  
8 using the credibility of this group and the councils  
9 to help bolster the story.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Thank you for a  
11 good discussion and a good series of presentations.  
12 And I was anticipating that we might end that item a  
13 little bit early. In our June conference call, we had  
14 a discussion of a series of recommendations on the  
15 Magnuson Act, and one of the ones that we couldn't  
16 achieve any resolution on was the recommendation on  
17 the use of "overfished" versus "depleted".

18 Now, before I engage on that, I want to know  
19 whether or not it's even relevant at this point. Is  
20 the timing still useful for us to contribute any  
21 feedback on Magnuson reauthorization issues?

22 MR. RAUCH: Let me break it into two parts.  
23 One, as you know, on the Hill we have a House bill  
24 that has passed committee. We have a Senate  
25 discussion draft which has not even been introduced.

1 So my belief is that the Congress will not as a body  
2 take this up this year. They're running out of time  
3 to do that. So I think that this will be on the  
4 legislative agenda for next year and that the various  
5 House and Senate bills will have to be reintroduced.  
6 They won't carry over with the new Congress. It'll be  
7 reintroduced. And so this discussion will continue  
8 well into next year I believe.

9 The Administration, as you know, is  
10 considering what its position might or might not be,  
11 and it has not taken a position on any of these  
12 topics. While MAFAC does not advise Congress, you do  
13 advise us as to whether or not we should take various  
14 positions. This is a relevant issue in all the  
15 debates. It's in both the House and the Senate bill.  
16 The Administration will have to take a position I  
17 imagine. We've not taken one yet, so it is still  
18 timely, what your advice to us is on that  
19 recommendation, whether or not we have a bill.

20 Either we'll have a bill in which we will  
21 lay out our position, or we will be responding just to  
22 the House bill. Your opinions on that will help us  
23 formulate whatever response we have.

24 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Sam. That's  
25 very helpful. So, when we squeezed it into the

1 agenda, we put it in on the third day, and I'm just  
2 seeing a window of opportunity now to get a little bit  
3 of business done, open up that third day. And then  
4 given that we have other issues that are emerging, it  
5 will give us some ability to adapt. So I would like  
6 to, in light of your comments, move the item forward  
7 and then just engage in the discussion.

8           What we had was a recommendation that came  
9 from our folks who worked on the issue of staying  
10 neutral. The discussion that took place in the  
11 conference call demonstrated that the committee was  
12 divided. We couldn't really seem to reach any  
13 meaningful consensus on the issue, so there is an  
14 issue paper that's in the agenda materials and in the  
15 backup materials that demonstrates we just didn't have  
16 a viewpoint. Julie and Dave, I'll turn it over to you  
17 to lead the discussion.

18           MS. MORRIS: Well, there were two issues  
19 that the issue paper looked at, and this was very  
20 early in the Magnuson reauthorization process. There  
21 was language proposed in the House that both changed  
22 the word "overfished" to "depleted" but also changed  
23 the benchmarks and the whole science system for  
24 figuring out when a stock had entered the depleted  
25 status.



1           And so our recommendation from the working  
2   group was to stay neutral on the change of the word.  
3   We could see reasons for and against that. But to be  
4   very clearly opposed to the redefinition of when a  
5   stock slipped into this status of being depleted,  
6   which was going to have to be redefined and  
7   reassessed.

8           And I think everybody agreed on the second  
9   part. We didn't want a new definition of the  
10  benchmarks for overfished and the things that kick in  
11  for the recovery of something when it reaches that  
12  status. But the question of whether we should change  
13  the word "overfished" to "depleted," there was not a  
14  consensus, and I don't think we got to the point of  
15  taking a vote on it.

16           So the reasons to change to "depleted" is  
17  that people hear "overfishing" and "overfished" and  
18  they don't differentiate between the "ed" and the  
19  "ing," and it's confusing to people who are new to our  
20  system of managing fish in the EEZ. Also "overfished"  
21  sort of points the finger at fishing as the cause for  
22  the stock decline, and often there's many other  
23  factors that are contributing to that decline. And so  
24  "depleted" is a more accurate representation.

25           The counterargument, the argument to not

1 change anything is that maybe since fishing is what we  
2 can manage, even if a species, a stock falls into an  
3 overfished status, because our levers within the  
4 Agency have to do with managing the level of fishing,  
5 we do have to sometimes go straight to fishing and so  
6 it's good to keep that in the terms.

7 Also because everybody who's already inside  
8 the management process knows that term and uses it and  
9 it's well defined. And there would have to be a lot  
10 of editorial changes everywhere to change everything  
11 from "overfished" to "depleted." And so we ended up  
12 recommending not being opposed and not being  
13 supportive of the change from "overfish" to  
14 "depleted", not taking a position on it, which is  
15 probably not very helpful to the Agency. But we were  
16 of divided opinion, but we have not voted on it.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Dave, did you have  
18 anything to add to that discussion?

19 MR. WALLACE: Well, Julie did a great job.  
20 It was reasonably contentious, and I probably never  
21 really recognized why. But the fact is that an  
22 overfished stock that is fished down to a couple of  
23 percentage of the threshold is overfished no matter  
24 whether these fish died because the environment that  
25 they require has changed and they could move, taking

1       into consideration sedentary critters like shellfish.

2               Just because they died of some cause besides  
3       fishing doesn't mean that they aren't overfished in  
4       the purest sense of the word, you know. You shouldn't  
5       be fishing them or you should be fishing them very  
6       conservatively because of their situation. And so,  
7       you know, from my own personal point of view, I  
8       thought trying to redefine the Magnuson Act by saying  
9       "depleted" is different than "overfished" and then if  
10      we use the word "depleted," then we have to redefine  
11      the whole act, and so I was not a big advocate that.

12             And right at the moment we have sort of a  
13      stalemate. And unfortunately, one of the people who  
14      changed from supporting the position to then  
15      advocating for depleted is not here, and that's a  
16      shame because he was sort of the person that tipped  
17      the balance. And so, you know, I want to just open it  
18      for discussion, and can we find a consensus. And if  
19      we can, great. And if we can't, well, we're just no  
20      worse off than we are right now.

21             So, you know, who would like to start the  
22      conversation? Okay. Phil?

23             MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Dave. I think you  
24      very succinctly presented those two sides, Julie, and  
25      thank you for that. But did I hear you say that one

1 of the reasons we didn't want to use "depleted" was  
2 because we don't have any wherewithal to address those  
3 issues, we can only address whether it's overfished or  
4 not? Could you explain that a little bit more  
5 clearly?

6 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Well, maybe I'll read  
7 the recommendation so that I don't use the wrong words  
8 and confuse everybody.

9 First is the point that Ted Ames was making  
10 in our last discussion. However, "depleted" indicates  
11 the stock status without pointing out a particular  
12 cause, fishing. However, changing to "depleted" may  
13 lead to an attitude that overfishing can continue  
14 since the primary cause of fishing is elsewhere.  
15 Managing harvest is the primary tool that fisheries  
16 managers must employ to address overfished, depleted  
17 stocks regardless of the cause.

18 And then on to a different point, which is  
19 changing the word "would require many editorial  
20 changes in current regulations and management plans  
21 and unnecessary burden on staff time with limited  
22 benefits."

23 MR. DYSKOW: It does. The only thing that  
24 came to mind, and maybe it's not a relevant point, but  
25 some stocks are depleted because other fish eat them.

1 Goliath grouper are a classic example. They eat  
2 everything, and they have depleted the stock of gag  
3 grouper, red grouper, and go right down the line  
4 because they're not being managed appropriately given  
5 that context. So, in some cases, the solution to the  
6 depletion of gag grouper would be to manage Goliath  
7 grouper more effectively. I'm not saying we should do  
8 that. I'm just using that as an example.

9 So, in many respects, "depleted" does give  
10 us options, management options. We can't assume that  
11 it doesn't.

12 MR. WALLACE: We can only manage fishermen.  
13 We haven't figured out how to manage the fish yet.  
14 And that's a serious problem, but we're working on it.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. WALLACE: Michele?

17 MS. EDER: Thank you. I want to thank Julie  
18 and Dave and the committee, particularly Julie, for  
19 your neutral reporting out of I think the position,  
20 and that's really helpful in the discussion. I really  
21 want to emphasize that I don't support changing the  
22 definition as Julie mentioned, that we are in  
23 agreement about that. But where we do diverge is on  
24 the word "overfishing," "overfished," and/or  
25 "depleted."

1           I do represent commercial fishing interests  
2   on the West Coast. I can't say I speak for all of  
3   them. But I am in favor of changing the word to  
4   "depleted." I think that Eileen kind of addressed it  
5   in your opening remarks when you spoke of it's not so  
6   much about managing fishermen as much as we go forward  
7   as acknowledging the effect of other factors in terms  
8   of what NOAA's vision is looking forward. And I think  
9   a change in that word would then reflect also some of  
10   what it looks like the stated goals or vision of the  
11   Agency is.

12           And I think coming from a commercial fishing  
13   perspective, just a couple of things. When I look at  
14   the legislation, I understand that those who are  
15   familiar with the federal management process and those  
16   who are familiar with what the rules are within the  
17   EEZ, et cetera, they're comfortable with the word.  
18   They know that it's not a bounce at fishermen or  
19   critical of them per se.

20           But when we look at overall legislation, I  
21   think first of all what's important to look at is  
22   what's the public perception. Commercial fishing in  
23   this country, you know, what do we do, as I've said  
24   many times before, what my sons say to me, we feed  
25   people, Mom. That's what we do. And so embracing,

1 recognizing that it's not the activities of the  
2 fishermen per se and that there are other factors, I  
3 think "depleted" reflects that and addresses the  
4 public perception.

5 Commercial fishing, we're not overfishing in  
6 terms of the actions. And to not have a negative  
7 reputation or picture within the larger U.S. community  
8 is really important to the fishing community itself.  
9 And I think that also not only addressing what the  
10 public perception is of commercial fishing but also  
11 recognizing and respecting the community of commercial  
12 fishermen.

13 I think a change in the word to "depleted"  
14 would truly do that and I think would send, if the  
15 Agency took that position, would send a message from  
16 the Agency to the commercial fishing community at the  
17 very least that we recognize the tremendous changes in  
18 behavior and in fishing practices that we've seen over  
19 the last 10 years in terms of different regiments that  
20 have been implemented in fishing, whether it be  
21 limited access privileges, et cetera.

22 And so I think the Agency could speak to the  
23 commercial fishing community in that way in supporting  
24 a change in that language. So thank you. That kind  
25 of summarizes comments there.

1 MR. WALLACE: Tony?

2 MR. CHATWIN: Thank you. You know, my  
3 opinion on this issue really depends on what response  
4 it would trigger. So, if the term "depleted" was  
5 added, because I don't think it should be substituted  
6 for "overfished" because there are times when a stock  
7 may be at depressed levels because of fishing. So, if  
8 it's added to the vocabulary, did your subcommittee  
9 discuss what sort of responses that would be expected  
10 to a designation of depleted?

11 MS. MORRIS: I think just what we've already  
12 touched on, that "depleted," and we didn't talk about  
13 adding it, we talked about substituting, so this is a  
14 new idea, adding it. It was just exactly what Michele  
15 was talking about and what we said before, that  
16 "depleted" opens up the reality that the stock has  
17 fallen to a seriously low level and needs to be  
18 rebuilt regardless of the cause.

19 And so I guess the only discussions we had  
20 about the effect were people new to fisheries  
21 management wouldn't be confused about what's the  
22 difference between "overfished" and "overfishing"  
23 because the words would be different and also that it  
24 would reduce this idea that if a stock needed to be  
25 rebuilt it was because of fishing. It would open up a



1 larger set of causes.

2 MR. WALLACE: And I'll give you an example,  
3 and I probably shouldn't do this. Years ago this  
4 committee wrote a white paper to the Administration on  
5 what a disaster designation should be based on, and  
6 they accepted it. And the first thing it said was  
7 thou shalt not overfish and that be a disaster.

8 And so I'll give you a real-life position  
9 now. The New England ground fish, the cod in  
10 particular, has completely collapsed. Now I used to  
11 write a newsletter for banks before 2008 when the  
12 banks got in trouble, and they financed fishing  
13 interests on the East Coast. We followed that  
14 closely, and then that was before they had to have a  
15 hard tack. And the New England was on days at sea.  
16 And a short story is for 30 years they exceeded their  
17 target quota by 300 to 500 percent.

18 And then all of a sudden there were no fish,  
19 and they said how could that happen, and it must be  
20 something besides overfishing because now we're going  
21 to apply for disaster relief, which they got, by the  
22 way. And now they're complaining that wasn't enough  
23 and they're going to have to apply for more because  
24 now the stock has gone from 18 percent of the  
25 threshold to 3 percent of the threshold. Just a

1 couple weeks ago, that was confirmed by a peer review  
2 group and their SSC. And so it was supposed to be a  
3 bycatch only because they cut it at 80 percent two  
4 years ago, and now they're going to cut it another 80  
5 percent.

6 And so this is a depleted stock, and we  
7 didn't have anything to do with it, and therefore, the  
8 government should step in and resolve this issue for  
9 us by sending us huge amounts of money in the hundreds  
10 of millions of dollars. And so that's the reason that  
11 I think that if we get into actually having a  
12 definition of "depleted," that's how it's going to be  
13 used in my opinion. Any comments to my example?

14 MR. CHATWIN: It's an interesting example.  
15 Again, just back to my point, I think that, you know,  
16 that question of what response is triggered by this  
17 new term is key. And we need to, if we are going to  
18 advance a recommendation, we need to address that as a  
19 committee would be my suggestion.

20 MR. WALLACE: Paul?

21 MR. CLAMPITT: Thank you. My question is if  
22 we change the word to "depleted" from "overfished",  
23 how is that changing -- I mean, it's largely semantic,  
24 right? I mean, how does that change the law? I mean,  
25 if you reach depleted levels, you would still have

1 certain laws that would kick in to prevent from  
2 depleting it further. So I don't see how just  
3 changing the name would cause this gaming of some  
4 system where you're allowed to fish stocks to  
5 extinction, unless I'm mistaken.

6 MR. WALLACE: Keith?

7 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: As I'm listening to the  
8 discussion and I'm hearing Tony and I'm hearing Paul,  
9 it sounds like there's not necessarily opposition to  
10 changing the term. It's fear of what happens if we do  
11 change the term. And I'm wondering if we can just put  
12 a sentence in that says something to the effect of  
13 we're okay with changing the term as long as it  
14 doesn't change the outcomes. For example, although a  
15 fishery stock may be considered depleted due to  
16 factors not related to fishing, the replacement of the  
17 term "overfished" with the term "depleted" shouldn't  
18 be interpreted to alter NOAA's authority.

19 I mean, if we simply said that as part of  
20 this paper, would that satisfy the concerns with  
21 changing the term?

22 MR. BROWN: The first question that comes to  
23 my mind is how did we get here. And I think the whole  
24 idea of sustainability of stocks is part of what got  
25 us where we are now. And there's been a general

1 overall perception that fishers will take the last one  
2 swimming and that NOAA needed to tighten up its  
3 regulatory process.

4 And we've made a lot of progress, and for us  
5 to go back and change this definition as sort of a  
6 window dressing would send a signal to a lot of  
7 environmental folks that, just as Dave said, it's not  
8 me, it's somebody else. And, you know, the stock  
9 assessments that have to be done, you know, really  
10 determine the status of the stocks. And it's  
11 important for us to, you know, focus on fishing, which  
12 NOAA regulates.

13 And if we were to increase the level of  
14 fishing in areas where the stocks are depleted, then  
15 that would be sanctioning fishers to go out and  
16 overharvest. And somewhere in this argument, as I  
17 listen to Ted, people are saying, well, we don't be  
18 considered as the bad guys. And my perception is that  
19 there are a number of contributing factors that lead  
20 to depleted stocks, but unless a stock is sustainable,  
21 NOAA can't fish. So I don't see where changing the  
22 definition helps anything. I think it sends a signal  
23 that we're going backwards in the management of our  
24 fisheries. Joy?

25 MS. BONNEY: So I would support what Keith

1 put on the table as the compromise, which is basically  
2 just changing the name from, what, "overfished" to  
3 "depleted," which basically just expands what the  
4 possible causes are in terms of public perspective,  
5 but it doesn't change the authority for NMFS. So I  
6 think it's a good compromise as we move forward.

7 MR. WALLACE: Bob?

8 MR. BEAL: Thanks, David. ASMFC has been  
9 wrestling with this same question for about a decade,  
10 ever since the Long Island Sound lobster population  
11 crashed in the late 1990s. And, you know, there were  
12 a lot of lobsters removed from that area, but the  
13 water also got a lot warmer in that area.

14 So both were contributing factors to having  
15 not many lobsters in Long Island Sound, and there's a  
16 number of other stocks, Northern shrimp and some  
17 others, that were in the same spot now where, you  
18 know, significant numbers of animals were taken out,  
19 but the environmental conditions are really what's  
20 preventing them from coming back.

21 So the commission, you know, clearly  
22 recognized that there's a lot of reasons that stocks  
23 do go down and populations end up in bad shape. But  
24 also the perspective not to use "depleted" was that  
25 "depleted" seems like a very negative term or a very

1     grim term. You know, if your bank account is  
2     depleted, you're down to pennies, and just because  
3     you're down to 50 percent of a target biomass level,  
4     there's not an imminent concern about extinction or  
5     something along those lines. It's not in great shape  
6     and it should be rebuilt and it should be rebuilt, you  
7     know, substantially, but, you know, it's not as grim  
8     as, you know, down to pennies in your bank account  
9     type thing.

10           But with all that said, the ASMFC does use  
11     both of these terms for different stocks. If the  
12     commission feels there's a lot of contributing factors  
13     where the stock, you know, has resulted in the stock  
14     being in bad shape, we'll call it "depleted." If  
15     there's a significant signal that fishing has a lot to  
16     do with the stock being in bad shape, then we call it  
17     "overfished".

18           But the reality is the response is the same,  
19     kind of Paul's point, which is what does it matter  
20     whatever you call it. It's semantics. You've got to  
21     reduce the mortality associated with fishing and try t  
22     to turn things around and rebuild the stock. So, you  
23     know, we haven't solved this question over the last  
24     decade either, but the response is still the same. We  
25     need to take less critters out of the ocean.

1 MR. WALLACE: Tony and then Keith.

2 MR. CHATWIN: Well, thank you. Thank you,  
3 Bob, for that. There's no distinction in the  
4 response, like there isn't enhanced flexibility if  
5 it's term is found to be depleted as opposed to  
6 overfished?

7 MR. BEAL: No. We don't have anything in  
8 our fishery management plans that change the response.  
9 Once you cross below the biomass threshold and, you  
10 know, you're below that number, then a management  
11 response is triggered. But it's not different if it's  
12 warm water temperature versus, you know, overfishing.  
13 So it's the same response, to reduce.

14 MR. CHATWIN: Because when we -- sorry, Mr.  
15 Chairman. If we are to take action on the amended  
16 recommendation, it would be good to see the language.  
17 And I think we need to clarify what we mean by changes  
18 in NOAA's authority because that's a really broad  
19 statement. And I think there are some very specific  
20 rebuilding requirements in the MSA that, as I  
21 understand the discussion, we would not want to see  
22 changed as a result of this change in terms.

23 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Again, I'm just trying  
24 to simplify what struck me as a semantic debate. And  
25 just for everybody's benefit, I should point out the

1 term "depleted" is used in the MMPA, all right? So  
2 the word has already been used in the context of  
3 fishery management. Really this is a debate about  
4 trying to cure the tension that exists, as Julie  
5 pointed out at the beginning, between "overfished" and  
6 "overfishing" and the "ed" versus the "ing" and trying  
7 to help give that some clarity.

8 My compromise suggestion was to simply add a  
9 sentence into this that said "The mere replacement of  
10 the term 'overfished' with the term 'depleted' should  
11 not be interpreted to alter the authority of NOAA  
12 fisheries to regulate fishing activity." All right?  
13 That's the point I'm trying to make. I'll put that up  
14 on the board if we want. We can insert that into our  
15 report.

16 On Columbus's point, I just want to make  
17 sure everybody is clear. We're not changing the  
18 definition. We're not adopting a broader definition  
19 of what "overfished" or "depleted" means. We're not  
20 trying to modify NOAA's authority. I think we have  
21 consensus on that point, and it's just this semantic  
22 issue that I'm trying to help us get through.

23 MR. WALLACE: Julie?

24 MS. MORRIS: I'm going to suggest that we  
25 build on this discussion and bring something back on



1 Thursday morning but not talk a lot more about it  
2 right now. And so we could by Thursday morning have a  
3 more thoughtful approach to what Keith is suggesting.

4 I also want to look at how "overfished" is  
5 presented as a category in the Magnuson and the  
6 regulations and see if, you know, another idea would  
7 be to say "overfished" doesn't mean that fishing was  
8 the cause. Things can be depleted. You know, just  
9 have some clarification in Magnuson. It wouldn't go  
10 as far as everything changed from "overfished" to  
11 "depleted", but there would be some language there  
12 that addressed the perception.

13 So let us work between now and Thursday  
14 morning on some alternatives to look at and bring it  
15 back up for discussion in the time on the agenda  
16 that's been scheduled for that.

17 MR. WALLACE: Anyone object to that idea?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. WALLACE: Seeing no objection, then we  
20 will collectively work on it and get back on Thursday  
21 morning. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So we're a little bit  
23 ahead of schedule, which is good for us. Does any  
24 member have some commentary on any of this activity  
25 before we break for lunch?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Heidi, you want to pitch  
3 in and discuss the donations for --

4 MS. LOVETT: Oh, I was going to let you do  
5 that, but that's okay.

6 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. All right. So  
7 just a little housekeeping, and once again we've got  
8 some refreshments and coffee and whatnot in the  
9 corner. If folks could pitch in \$10 a piece, that  
10 would be great. Anybody who's here just for today or  
11 something and you want to throw a few dollars on the  
12 table, that would be great. Any other housekeeping?  
13 Tonight?

14 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. So I did want to let  
15 everybody know that we had scheduled a presentation at  
16 our Science on a Sphere, which is a big globe. I  
17 don't know if any of you have seen Science on a Sphere  
18 before, but we have a globe and it hangs from the  
19 ceiling. It's a way to portray a variety of data in a  
20 very visual manner just to portray and educate people  
21 about climate change, about how we use our data.

22 And so we have a presentation planned. It  
23 will follow the close of this meeting, and we do have  
24 maps on our table for where this is. It's essentially  
25 in the ground level of our office building, Building

1       3, on the NOAA campus.

2               Additionally, we got an invite for you all  
3       to visit the Gateway, NOAA Gateway, which is another  
4       facility over in the first level of the second  
5       building in our campus. And Cheryl Oliver has offered  
6       to do a presentation to MAFAC, and we thought that  
7       could be a nice early evening event before you go to  
8       dinner tomorrow evening after the meeting closes.

9               The Gateway is sort of a mini-museum. I  
10      haven't been in there in a little while myself, so I'm  
11      not sure what's in there at the moment. But it covers  
12      all of NOAA. It's very visual. Also it's very hands-  
13      on, and it's open to the public.

14              So we just wanted to get a show of hands of  
15      people that would be interested to make sure it was  
16      worth the while for Cheryl to stay late because that  
17      would be after 5:00 tomorrow. Yes?

18              MS. SOBECK: I'd just make a pitch for both  
19      of those. You know, Science on a Sphere, it's this  
20      huge, blank globe until there are these multi-  
21      projections.

22              MS. LOVETT: Right.

23              MS. SOBECK: So, you know, you can  
24      demonstrate sort of storm surges and the tsunami wave,  
25      the global impact of a tsunami wave. And I will say

1       that it was a real hit at the Kerry Ocean Conference  
2       and that Dr. Sullivan herself like wielded the  
3       controls and showed both Secretary Kerry and Leo  
4       DiCaprio sort of the whole Science on a Sphere  
5       experience. And at the end of it, Leo said that he  
6       would love to have one in his house because it was so  
7       incredibly cool.

8               (Laughter.)

9               MS. LOVETT: And it was designed and created  
10       by a NOAA scientist, which is also incredibly cool.

11              MS. SOBECK: So, I mean, I think, you know,  
12       it's part of kind of getting you guys to be  
13       ambassadors for NOAA's education and outreach and  
14       thinking about how we could use some of these tools to  
15       promote the Fisheries' mission. You know, it's a  
16       great promo for the Weather Service and the satellite  
17       program, but I think there are a lot of fisheries  
18       applications and, you know, explanations of climate  
19       change and how that affects the fish world. And so  
20       sort of seeing those tools. And, you know, we can  
21       tell you what facilities have Science on a Sphere and,  
22       you know, the Gateway kinds of tools.

23              And so I think just getting out there and  
24       sort of seeing some of those for yourself, I would  
25       highly recommend it. And they are, at least this

1 evening, Science on a Sphere is this evening, right?

2 MS. LOVETT: Uh-huh. Yes.

3 MS. SOBECK: So it gets you like two-thirds  
4 of the way to the happy hour.

5 MS. LOVETT: Exactly. And I think --

6 MS. SOBECK: More than that, three-quarters  
7 of the way.

8 MALE VOICE: Happy hour is across the  
9 street.

10 MS. SOBECK: Happy hour is across the street  
11 from Science on a Sphere. And we'd do happy hour  
12 first and Science on a Sphere afterwards, but you'd be  
13 too dizzy. So, no. So anyway, I would encourage you.  
14 So now I'll let you vote.

15 MS. LOVETT: Well, I just wanted to make  
16 sure, as I said. Tonight is definitely a go. Luis  
17 Leandra, who is our communications lead for the  
18 International Fisheries and who I think created or did  
19 the presentation I think at the State Department event  
20 that you were talking about, is the one doing the  
21 presentation for us tonight. And as I said, Cheryl  
22 Oliver, spouse to John Oliver, so some of you have  
23 probably met Cheryl in the past. She's the one who  
24 enthusiastically when she heard you were in town  
25 enthusiastically offered to give you a tour of the

1 Gateway. So I just want to make sure we have a  
2 majority of people planning to go there, and we'll let  
3 her know so she can plan. Sounds good? No noes?  
4 Okay. That was all I had. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. All right. Let's  
6 adjourn for lunch and plan to be back here at 1:00.  
7 Thanks, everybody.

8 (Whereupon, at 11:54 a.m., the meeting in  
9 the above-entitled matter was recessed, to reconvene  
10 at 1:00 p.m. this same day, Tuesday, September 23,  
11 2014.)

12 //

13 //

14 //

15 //

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

(1:07 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks for being punctual after lunch. Our next session is the report from the state directors, so we'll be hearing from Randy and Bob and David, and I think they agreed amongst themselves that Randy was going to start it off. So help us out, Randy.

MR. FISHER: Thank you. I got an idea.

(Laughter.)

FEMALE VOICE: I'll trade you, huh?

MR. FISHER: Yeah, for this one. Turn this one off. There. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Eileen mentioned and I think maybe Paul mentioned earlier this morning, a couple of weeks ago we had the Marine state directors and NOAA Fisheries headquarters folks together in San Diego. Every couple years we do this. We had 27 state directors there and we had 23 NOAA folks there for a couple days. The only states that were missing were Pennsylvania and Texas. Otherwise, we had a listing of all the state Marine directors.

In preparation for that meeting, we have done this a number of times in the past, and before it was a different format. So this year we decided in

1 advance that we wanted to really focus on the issues  
2 that the directors were concerned about. So we sent  
3 out a questionnaire in advance. It had a listing of  
4 about 30 questions, something like that, and asked  
5 folks to comment on whether or not they were  
6 satisfied, dissatisfied, neutral, or whatever they  
7 were with certain parts of the relationship between  
8 NOAA Fisheries and the state directors.

9 And the impetus of a lot of this was the  
10 whole word of "partnership" and what does that mean,  
11 and so there was a lot of discussion about that. So,  
12 as a result of the questionnaire, the following areas  
13 were identified as I would call them "opportunities"  
14 to improve the relationship that we have, and those  
15 areas of opportunities were budget development in  
16 outyears, recreational monitoring, commercial  
17 monitoring, bycatch, and the overall relationship.

18 So there was a number of decisions that were  
19 made that I think Dave and Bob can talk a little bit  
20 about, and the follow-up will be the key because the  
21 state directors are very interested in not only being  
22 just partners but real partners. So that's kind of  
23 what happened at that meeting, and I think Paul maybe  
24 has some follow-up also in terms of what headquarters  
25 and NOAA Fisheries is really going to do. So, with



1       that, I would ask David or Bob to add to that, Mr.  
2       Chairman.

3               MR. DONALDSON: I'll reiterate what Randy  
4       said. I think that it was a successful meeting. I've  
5       been to a number of national state directors, and I  
6       think this was one of the best ones. Part of the  
7       reason that it was successful was doing the survey  
8       ahead of time. Having a facilitator I think helped  
9       steer the discussion and make sure that we were being  
10      constructive and going in the right direction. And we  
11      also had a steering committee which consisted of the  
12      three executive directors as well as some state  
13      representation. And NOAA kind of molded or mapped out  
14      the agenda, and I think that was successful, and I'm  
15      not just saying that because I was part of the  
16      steering committee.

17               (Laughter.)

18               MALE VOICE: Yeah, you are.

19               MR. DONALDSON: But the bottom line is I  
20      think this was a successful meeting, but the ultimate  
21      success still remains to be seen. There needs to be  
22      some real follow-up. But, you know, one of the things  
23      that was discussed and talked about was getting input  
24      into the budget through the various regions. Roy  
25      Crabtree, who is our regional administrator in the

1 southeast, sat down and talked with our state  
2 directors while we were out there. We're planning to  
3 get together at the October council meeting to talk  
4 about issues and whatnot.

5           And I talked a little bit with our directors  
6 offline about feeding into that process, and while  
7 they're interested in doing that, they think that it  
8 could be productive, they are also a little concerned  
9 about bolstering NMFS's budget in the region. If the  
10 budget increases, some of that increase gets  
11 transferred or gets realized by the states and not  
12 just raising the level for National Marine Fisheries  
13 Service but for all the partners. And that ties into  
14 what Randy said about not just saying that we're  
15 partners but really truly being partners. Bob?

16           MR. BEAL: Thank you, David. I don't have a  
17 whole lot to add about the meeting other than to echo  
18 what Randy and Dave said. You know, it was a very  
19 productive meeting. I think the format was great, and  
20 I think we got a lot out of it. The East Coast state  
21 directors left the meeting feeling pretty confident  
22 that the relationship between NOAA Fisheries and the  
23 states is going to get better.

24           The East Coast, given the management  
25 authority that the Atlantic States Commission has, a

1     little bit different than the other two commissions,  
2     really wants to engage the leadership within the  
3     Northeast Region and the Southeast Region on getting  
4     the priorities lined up as early as possible. And,  
5     you know, Paul and others did a good job of saying,  
6     you know, getting the priorities lined up does not  
7     mean the states saying, all right, NOAA, we need X, Y,  
8     and Z, and then it happens. I think the states  
9     realize it needs to be a dialogue between the 15 East  
10    Coast states and the NOAA Fisheries in our case.

11           And the priorities from the East Coast  
12    perspective are really three dimensions: budget,  
13    assessments, and management. Since we have the  
14    management authority, we need the stock assessments  
15    and we need the alignment and complementary management  
16    with the three East Coast councils and the states  
17    along the East Coast. And I think that message was  
18    well received by NOAA Fisheries and the states that we  
19    need to work together.

20           And, in fact, John Bullard from the  
21    Northeast Regional Office or GARFO and Bill Karp from  
22    the Northeast Fisheries Science Center is coming to  
23    the ASMFC annual meeting at the end of October to  
24    start talking about those research and budget  
25    priorities and management priorities. We've invited

1 the Southeast regional administrator and Science  
2 Center director, but we don't have a lot of time on  
3 the agenda. For them to travel -- the meeting happens  
4 to be in Connecticut, so to travel all the way up to  
5 Connecticut for an hour or so may not be worth their  
6 while, but maybe we can get them to dial in at least,  
7 you know, on a conference call and hear the discussion  
8 and be able to participate to some degree. But I  
9 think that outcome is productive, and that, you know,  
10 from our perspective may be the first of many meetings  
11 that'll happen as follow-ups to that state directors'  
12 meeting.

13 The East Coast states also felt that they  
14 left San Diego feeling that communication is going to  
15 be improved across the board, and a lot of the issues  
16 really came down to communication. How can we, you  
17 know, talk early, talk often? And two specific areas  
18 were highly migratory species and Endangered Species  
19 Act. I gave a quick presentation on a couple East  
20 Coast examples of Endangered Species Act where from  
21 the state perspective Atlantic sturgeon didn't go that  
22 well, but the follow-up is going pretty well. River  
23 herring from start to finish has been productive and a  
24 good relationship between NOAA Fisheries, the  
25 Protected Resources Office, and the East Coast states.

1           So, you know, things are going better in the  
2   ESA Department. And, you know, I was kind of joking  
3   out there, well, we didn't like it because sturgeon  
4   were listed, river herring weren't listed, so we liked  
5   the outcome. But it really wasn't the outcome. It's  
6   the process. There were a number of workshops to open  
7   up that line of communication early on river herring.

8           And the states felt that NOAA Fisheries was  
9   considering all the available data when they made  
10   their decision on river herring, and that's really  
11   what the states want. They felt in the sturgeon  
12   example not all the data was available or considered,  
13   so I think those areas are getting a lot better.

14          And I think a testament to the success of  
15   the meeting was there was a lot of discussion about  
16   having those meetings more frequently. A lot of folks  
17   left, and I'm not sure it was consensus, but a lot of  
18   folks left saying we should do that on an annual basis  
19   or at least annually over the next few years to  
20   improve the relationship and improve the communication  
21   and then maybe we can revert back to biannual  
22   meetings.

23          But, you know, I think there was enough  
24   confidence in the outcome of that meeting that  
25   repeating that and kind of checking in on what the

1 states and federal government promised each other, you  
2 know, are they really living up to those promises.  
3 And waiting two years for that check-in probably is  
4 too long, so there is some commitment to get together  
5 sooner rather than later. Maybe it's 15 months, 18  
6 months, I don't know. But waiting two years seemed to  
7 be a bit too long for those meetings.

8           So those are the highlights, you know. One  
9 big change that's pending on the East Coast is the  
10 MRIP survey, the Marine Recreational Information  
11 Program. The other two coasts already do this where  
12 the states run their intercept portion of that survey  
13 where they go to the docks and the marinas and the  
14 beaches and they interview folks on the success rate  
15 of their fishing trips and what they caught and take  
16 the biological samples.

17           On the East Coast that's still done through  
18 a contractor. The states don't conduct that survey.  
19 But we're in the process of transitioning to a program  
20 where the states will actually conduct that intercept  
21 portion of the MRIP survey. And hopefully, all things  
22 going as they should, we'll kick that off January 1,  
23 2016.

24           And in my budget priority conversation out  
25 there, that was one of the things we wanted to make

1       sure that there's adequate funding available for that  
2       transition because there's going to be some startup  
3       costs and there's going to be some additional expenses  
4       for the first year or two, and we want to make sure  
5       that things don't go bad because in the MRIP world and  
6       the recreational community, if things go bad, it takes  
7       a long time to get that bad taste out of folks'  
8       mouths. So we want to make sure that that program  
9       gets up running and the state conduct of that survey  
10      works, you know, seamlessly.

11               And, in fact, you know, I don't think we  
12      need a lot more money. I think we just need to make  
13      sure we're kind of level funded and we can use the  
14      money that's going to a contractor now and the states  
15      can access that money to conduct the survey. And  
16      hopefully we can actually get better data with similar  
17      levels of funding as the overall goal of this because  
18      the state conduct should lead to more confidence in  
19      the state from the fishing community.

20               And so I think all the states on the East  
21      Coast feel it's the right direction to go, but it's  
22      going to be a heavy lift to make the transition. So  
23      those are my highlights that I had scribbled down  
24      here, but it was a successful meeting and a good use  
25      of everyone's time to go there for two days.

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Paul?

2 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you. If I could, Mr.  
3 Chair, I wanted to follow up on some comments that  
4 Randy made at the outset. From our perspective,  
5 certainly concur that it was a very productive meeting  
6 and I think kind of setting us on a good path. And I  
7 did want to emphasize a couple of things that  
8 Fisheries committed to as a result of this discussion  
9 with the community at large, as well as specifically  
10 with the commission directors.

11 There was an extensive discussion about this  
12 issue of engagement and budget and planning. And we  
13 are doing, as I think many of you know, much more  
14 concentrated and systematic planning in our science  
15 centers. We have recently pushed for the same level  
16 of sort of strategic thinking and program portfolio  
17 management among the regional offices and a very close  
18 connection between the two.

19 So we're building capacity in the  
20 organization. I talk about being a regionally  
21 centered, science-driven mission agency. The work of  
22 our organization gets carried out all across the  
23 nation but very dominantly in the regions, and we are  
24 encouraging through this process much tighter  
25 connections between our science planning and our



1 regional office planning and want to weave in and made  
2 the commitment in this meeting to systematically weave  
3 in views of our partnership community. And this isn't  
4 just using the term "partnership" lightly. There was  
5 actually a little bit of discussion about that. I  
6 would put the state directors or commission directors  
7 in the strategic alliance category, as I was talking  
8 about earlier. You know, these are important facets  
9 of really a multi-sector, multi-organizational  
10 approach to getting broad mission objectives achieved.

11 And I think there was sentiment expressed in  
12 the meeting that we could do a lot better in how we  
13 did that. And one of the ways is to have at the  
14 regional level input from the states and from the  
15 commissions in this regionally centered science  
16 management planning effort that we are admittedly  
17 building into the organization now as we continue to  
18 grow organizationally and in our sort of planning  
19 sophistication. So that was one commitment.

20 And I think that was generally well  
21 received. I think there was a little bit of a  
22 subcurrent about planning fatigue and a little bit  
23 more energy on let's get real and talk about funding  
24 commitments, and that ties into the conversation we  
25 had earlier this morning. Eileen specifically

1 committed and we subsequently have reiterated to our  
2 leadership team and will be doing so formally that we  
3 expect all of our regional leadership, our science  
4 centers and our regional offices, to engage in the  
5 front end of our budget consideration. So right now  
6 that would be the front end for '17; to get the views  
7 and input and budgetary concerns of our state and  
8 commission partners and to bring that forward in their  
9 discussion in side fisheries as we work towards the  
10 formulation of the FY '17 and future budget years.

11 And while we have always sought to include  
12 that input, that's a finer point on exactly when and  
13 through what channels that I think would be helpful on  
14 both ends. It will be helpful on our end  
15 systematically understanding the needs and concerns in  
16 the front end of the process of the states broadly  
17 construed. And I also think for the states, it gives  
18 them a known time and place and venue, if you will, to  
19 do exactly that, to have that input and to be able to  
20 follow up on that as appropriate and as we can over  
21 time.

22 It is a remarkably convoluted process, the  
23 budget, from formulation to actual appropriation, and  
24 I think everybody realizes, and I appreciate Bob  
25 acknowledging that, you know, what you start off with

1 is never what you end up with and there's lots of  
2 intermediating things. But we want to be working  
3 together. We want to be understanding of our  
4 priorities and what that means in fiscal terms in  
5 having, as Bob put it, more frequent and better  
6 communications about where we stand and what we're  
7 trying to do about it.

8 So extremely productive meeting, and we very  
9 much appreciate the thought that went into it, and I  
10 know the Pacific States Commission in particular  
11 played a key role here in thinking through the  
12 interests and getting the agenda right. So the front  
13 end work, you know, the beginning, the front end work  
14 was a substantial contributor to the efficiency and  
15 overall productivity of the meeting, and it was very  
16 well done. So we did make those commitments, as Randy  
17 alluded to, and we're very pleased to be stepping out  
18 in that direction.

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Thanks to  
20 the states for the reports. You know, one of the  
21 things I always look for as I hear from the three of  
22 you is what consistencies are there and what overlap  
23 is there and where are there opportunities based on  
24 what you're experiencing at the state council levels  
25 for MAFAC to weigh in with national direction. And,

1     you know, we've heard about budget development already  
2     this morning, and we're hearing that being echoed by  
3     you gentlemen.

4             In the past, we've tried as a committee to  
5     go through some budget exercises where we try to weigh  
6     relative priorities and give suggestions. Do you have  
7     any specific insights on the budget as to what kind of  
8     thing you'd like MAFAC to do to participate in that  
9     dialogue? And then on an issue that we've been  
10    talking about but didn't quite make it onto this  
11    agenda, the zero bycatch concept, you know, and the  
12    movement in Europe to, you know, really regulate  
13    bycatch more. Do you have any thoughts on where MAFAC  
14    could be in the year ahead on that issue as well?

15            MR. FISHER: This thing is probably -- is it  
16    okay? Yeah. I would offer this as something to think  
17    about. The three issues that Eileen outlined that she  
18    wanted MAFAC to work on were climate change,  
19    aquaculture, and recovery planning or recovery  
20    planning, yeah.

21            I think the interesting thing to me always  
22    is so are those new initiatives that we're going to  
23    spend more money on or are they new initiatives that  
24    we're not going to spend any more money on but we're  
25    going to talk about, because one of the things that we

1 learned when we went down to San Diego was if there is  
2 a soft spot in terms of NOAA's budget process, it's  
3 probably with the science centers, and the "soft spot"  
4 meaning if you really look at what they do, there were  
5 some complaints about why is this science center doing  
6 that when it has nothing to do with management? And  
7 that's a true complaint I think depending on where you  
8 are in the world.

9           So, when you start looking at things like  
10 climate change, you've got to start thinking about,  
11 well, what's NOAA's real responsibility under climate  
12 change? You don't have any real regulatory authority  
13 in the real world, so what is it? Is it going to be  
14 just basically figuring out what climate change is  
15 doing to the fish stock so that we can assure that we  
16 get ahead of the curve and we know what's happening?  
17 That's one possibility.

18           Is it going to be that we're going to dream  
19 up a whole bunch of new modeling things that are going  
20 to cost a lot of money and we're not sure what they're  
21 going to do? That's another possibility.

22           So there's a number of possibilities under  
23 here. But I think in terms of MAFAC, the thing you've  
24 got to think about is there really is only so much  
25 money, and so how are we best going to spend that?

1 You know, I mean, some of these we have a lot of  
2 experience. If you ask me about aquaculture, I'll say  
3 the biggest mistake ever made in the aquaculture  
4 program was nobody ever went to the governors' offices  
5 and sat down and said here's what we really want to do  
6 with aquaculture so you get the governor on your side.  
7 That never happened.

8 And the result is we don't have federal  
9 legislation. We've all worked on it forever, but it  
10 still doesn't exist. And I think one of the reasons  
11 is that you got a lot of pushback from some of the  
12 state governors and from the commercial fleet, which  
13 is still worried about aquaculture to some degree.

14 Recovery planning, once again, same issue.  
15 What are you going to do? You don't have any real  
16 regulatory authority under recovery planning. So what  
17 can you really do to make a difference in terms of  
18 direction given to NOAA? So those would be my  
19 comments.

20 MR. BEAL: Just to follow up a bit on what  
21 Randy said, you know, the reality is there is a finite  
22 fund of money available for us to spend on fisheries,  
23 and I think getting at that very issue may be  
24 something that collectively MAFAC can tackle, which  
25 is, you know -- I apologize, I wasn't here for Paul's

1 presentation this morning, but I know in past  
2 presentations he's done a very good job of indicating  
3 how the purchasing power of the dollars that goes to  
4 NOAA and ultimately the commissions and states is  
5 diminished. You know, some years it's gone up, and  
6 with inflation and other things and the price of fuel  
7 for research vessels or whatever it is, you know,  
8 travel for all of us. You know, everything is getting  
9 more expensive, but the available money is static or  
10 even decreasing or maybe going up a little but not  
11 enough to cancel out inflation.

12 And I think, you know, the folks on MAFAC  
13 have a lot of clout and a lot of ability to talk to  
14 our elected officials and, you know, highlight some of  
15 those concerns. And, you know, I don't think it  
16 should be a state dollars versus federal dollars  
17 issue. I think it's just fishery management dollars.  
18 We don't have enough of them to do what we want to do.  
19 And how do we try to find a few more dollars out of  
20 Capitol Hill to do some of these things?

21 And on the scale of money that's flying  
22 around Capitol Hill, you know, the few million that  
23 we're asking for here and there is a lot of money to  
24 us individually, but on Capitol Hill scale it's not a  
25 lot of money. And I think we can put together a

1 message where we highlight, you know, what we're  
2 missing right now and what we're not able to  
3 accomplish because of lack of funds. And, you know,  
4 with fairly modest investments from Capitol Hill, what  
5 can we get back and how can that impact jobs and the  
6 economy as a whole?

7           So I think, you know, getting that message  
8 out there would be important. It's sort of a  
9 motherhood apple pie thing, but I think we need  
10 something to pull ourselves up by the bootstraps  
11 because we just don't have the funds to do everything  
12 we want to do right now. And, you know, I don't have  
13 a lot of input on prioritizing one area over another  
14 right now, but, you know, it's just not enough to go  
15 around.

16           MR. DONALDSON: I don't know that I can add  
17 much more to that, so I would reiterate what they  
18 said.

19           MR. CHATWIN: Thank you. Thank you to all  
20 three of you for your update on the meeting. It  
21 sounds like it was a really productive meeting.

22           Just some of the remarks that you're making  
23 about seeking help from us for just advocating for a  
24 greater amount of availability of Fisheries funds made  
25 me think of, well, where is there areas of potential



1 growth that could be relevant. And one area that I  
2 see is this enhanced focus on resilience of coastal  
3 communities. And I see a gap, and the gap is silence  
4 on what fishing communities need to be resilient. And  
5 I think that you could approach that question through,  
6 you know, enhanced ability to operate the businesses,  
7 enhanced ability to understand how the resources they  
8 depend on are faring. Well, those are two. I'd love  
9 to see a third, but it's not coming to mind.

10 But I don't hear those values being espoused  
11 by the folks that are talking about resilient coastal  
12 communities. And I think that there might be an  
13 opportunity there. I wondered if any of the states  
14 have raised that issue in the discussions that you  
15 have.

16 MR. FISHER: Well, part of the issue is  
17 related to the whole concept of ocean planning anyway.  
18 I mean, when you're looking at what the Administration  
19 wanted to do was basically set up another layer to  
20 look at planning, you know, on the coast, which  
21 included resilience communities and fishing-related  
22 activity. So then the big panic struck with the  
23 councils that said, well, wait a minute, you're just  
24 recreating something that's already existing that  
25 takes into effect those sorts of things. And then, as

1     you know, Congress in great wisdom said, well, we're  
2     not going to allow you to fund any of that stuff  
3     anyway, so have a nice day.

4             So I think the answer is it didn't  
5     specifically come up, but it circles around this whole  
6     thing about where are we in terms of ocean planning.  
7     And right now it's not funded, and that's kind of  
8     where we are in this mess. In fact, one of the issues  
9     at my annual meeting came up was exactly that, where  
10    are we in that whole issue of ocean planning and who's  
11    doing what and all those sorts of things. So I think  
12    it's there, but, you know, it didn't specifically come  
13    up to my knowledge at least.

14            MR. CHATWIN: And I'll just give an example  
15    if I may. On the East Coast, there was an immense  
16    effort for recovery after the Super Storm Sandy  
17    impacts, and one of the main activities there is  
18    talking about sort of beach nourishment, building  
19    dunes, building wetlands to sort of ameliorate the  
20    impact of future storm surges, and all those require  
21    sand, and the sand extraction is being sort of managed  
22    by BOEM.

23            And that's all well and good, but the impact  
24    of that sand extraction on fishing communities is one  
25    that I think it would be something that we would all

1 be interested in knowing more about. So it's not so  
2 much the ocean zoning and ocean coastal policy. I  
3 know it's connected, but those are the sort of issues  
4 where I think -- you know, BOEM entered into an  
5 agreement with every coastal state in the affected  
6 area to do a survey of the sand resources, and I'm not  
7 sure if that's going to include analysis of the impact  
8 of harvesting those sources, the economic impact of  
9 harvesting those resources to coastal communities.

10 So I don't have a specific recommendation,  
11 but that's an area where, you know, I think we could  
12 do with a greater, a stronger voice from the fishing  
13 communities.

14 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Other members? Anything  
15 to weigh in on the state dialogue? Bob?

16 MR. BEAL: Just kind of related to what Tony  
17 said. You know, I think from the East Coast  
18 perspective, supporting science and data collection is  
19 the priority. We don't need more time for our  
20 commissioners to get together and talk or the council  
21 members to get together and talk. We need solid  
22 science for them to base decisions.

23 And the assessment output from the Science  
24 Center, those guys, you know, they're working flat out  
25 and they're doing everything they can. They just

1 don't have the capacity to meet the demands of what  
2 the three councils and ASMFC want, four councils if  
3 you take in the Gulf or five with the Caribbean.

4           You know, the two science centers on the  
5 East Coast are trying to cover a lot of ground and a  
6 lot of species and they just don't have the resources  
7 to do it. And as Randy mentioned, you know, there is  
8 questions about priority work for those folks and are  
9 the projects they're working on always aligned with  
10 what the fishery managers want.

11           This issue, I went to the Northeast and the  
12 Southeast Fisheries Science Center review of the  
13 assessment process, and at both of those meetings  
14 there was a lot of dialogue on, you know, publishing  
15 papers and keeping those folks relevant in the  
16 scientific community versus sort of assessment  
17 throughput, how many assessments should the Science  
18 Center be able to crank out and how much time should  
19 we spend on that versus keeping their publication list  
20 up to date and staying relevant in the scientific  
21 world.

22           And, you know, the performance reviews of  
23 the Science Center assessment biologists are linked to  
24 publishing papers in some instances, and is that right  
25 or wrong? You know, I've got some opinions on that,

1 and I think they spend a fair amount of time on  
2 scientific journal articles. But, you know, should  
3 that be changed and should that system be modified to  
4 some degree to allow for greater throughput of  
5 assessments?

6           You know, those scientists took those jobs  
7 with the anticipation they could work on research and  
8 do other things, so it's a change to their  
9 expectations of what they get out of those positions,  
10 and that's difficult to do after folks have been in  
11 that for a while. But I think having that dialogue  
12 may be worthwhile, but budget-wise funding for just  
13 basic science is the priority for the East Coast  
14 anyway.

15           MS. BONNEY: To kind of turn this issue  
16 around a little bit. So, I mean, I'm hearing from the  
17 states and the feds it's really about funding and  
18 having a conversation for what the funding should be  
19 from the state perspective. But I think, what, was it  
20 three years ago or so there was the federal ask from  
21 NOAA was a reduction that hit the states and the  
22 councils by some amount of money. And based on what  
23 you're saying, you weren't a part of that conversation  
24 when that budget appropriation was asked.

25           And so, at this point, you're asking to be

1 at the table to have that conversation so that your  
2 needs are met along with, because it's kind of like a  
3 parent-adult relationship where the feds are the ones  
4 that are making the request and then you're kind of  
5 going along with whatever the request is. And so at  
6 least if you have a seat at the table to have that  
7 conversation, then hopefully both sides are agreeing  
8 with what the overall budget should be when you go in  
9 and make the ask because obviously you can actually  
10 lobby for funding at the state level while really the  
11 feds can't.

12 So, I mean, is that kind of the backdrop of  
13 why you ended up as this being one of the high  
14 priorities at your meeting, so that everybody feels  
15 like you're all on the same team and you're all  
16 working for the same goal and you didn't have a  
17 structure to get on the same team?

18 MR. FISHER: The short answer is yes, I  
19 mean, because we do lobby for them, and Paul has been  
20 very open with that process. I mean, we saw it all,  
21 and that's been really a great improvement. But, I  
22 mean, the thing that happened to tell you the truth  
23 was this whole thing with IJ money that disappeared,  
24 and yet we were still hearing that we were partners.  
25 And that's what really set everybody off. So we

1       needed to solve that problem, and that's part of the  
2       reason why we had this meeting. The more we can  
3       understand from our needs and the more they understand  
4       our needs, the better off we're all going to be. And  
5       that's what it was all about.

6               MS. BONNEY: So just one more follow-up  
7       question then. So from what I think I heard you say  
8       in terms of a construct, you're going to be having  
9       conversations with the science centers within your  
10      region and then also the NMFS regional managers to  
11      kind of break it down at the regional level and then  
12      that would go up to headquarters. Is that what you  
13      guys are recommending for a process?

14             MR. FISHER: That's what we're dreaming of.

15             MS. BONNEY: Okay. So then let me follow up  
16      on one other question, and we're talking money. So  
17      the other thing that I get concerned about is, which  
18      Bob brought up in terms of the assessment process and  
19      making sure that you have good science to inform  
20      assessment models, and I think that's a key for any  
21      fishery, any region across the nation.

22             And so we need to have, and now I guess I'm  
23      just throwing this out to the MAFAC Committee. But  
24      robbing one region, robbing Paul to pay Peter really  
25      isn't a good result. We need to, what, increase

1 funding overall for assessments versus taking from one  
2 region to support a different region.

3 So, in terms of budget and funding and  
4 basically coming up with the right construct for the  
5 states to inform the feds to actually push a budget  
6 and then also to make sure that we're not playing off  
7 each other but trying to push an overall budget seems  
8 to be a good platform at the end. So I don't know if  
9 anybody else has any comments on that.

10 MR. FISHER: Well, you know, I think it's a  
11 very interesting idea because I have been sitting here  
12 thinking a little bit about if you were to look at  
13 NOAA fisheries and start over from zero, where would  
14 you put your money? Would you put your money in the  
15 fisheries that gather the most money, like Alaska, for  
16 instance, or would you put your money in the Gulf  
17 because, you know, they have problems with red snapper  
18 or whatever?

19 So, when you start looking, it would be  
20 interesting to know how each of the science centers  
21 are funded, what that number is. It would be  
22 interesting to know what the regional number is within  
23 that construct. And then it would be interesting to  
24 know the value of the fisheries there, and then it  
25 would be interesting to know what percentage of the



1 stock assessments for those fisheries that are around  
2 that region or that council were done. You know, are  
3 they 80 percent complete, are they 10 or whatever they  
4 are? And I don't really know whether or not NOAA does  
5 that or whether they have or haven't, but I would be  
6 curious to know how that would work.

7 MR. DOREMUS: A couple different comments on  
8 that. Starting with sort of stock assessment science  
9 funding, we're moving stock assessment into science  
10 funding and then into some of the broader themes. We  
11 have been doing a lot of work and have been publishing  
12 information about the stock assessment prioritization  
13 process that is done on a regional scale. To my  
14 knowledge since the time that I've been in Fisheries,  
15 we have not ever done zero-based budgeting where we  
16 would address the type of question you asked, you  
17 know. If you started de novo, what would you build  
18 and to what standards?

19 It is a complicated issue. Valuation is one  
20 thing you would want to consider, but it's not the  
21 only thing. And we do have a great deal of variation  
22 in the nature and complexity of the stocks that we  
23 manage, the stocks that we have information about, the  
24 ones that we don't. And I think there's no real easy  
25 algorithm for what is the right size. I think it is a

1 good question to ask. We don't have a ready answer  
2 for it, but we can give you a very clear answer on how  
3 we prioritize the stock assessment process.

4 We have found in this process that  
5 there's -- and this is something that I think maybe we  
6 can all collectively assist each other on. There's a  
7 lot less known about the resources that we do put into  
8 stock assessments than I would think would be the case  
9 given the level of attention to them. Very little is  
10 known about how much we actually put into the great  
11 case of red snapper, which is constantly being brought  
12 up as an example of insufficient. We put an  
13 extraordinary amount of science resources into that  
14 stock assessment process.

15 So better information at a start would be  
16 good, and we can break it down in different ways. We  
17 could easily show science regional office by region.  
18 That information is available. Where we want to go  
19 from there is another question that we can work on.

20 I'll make one other comment before I take a  
21 call from our science director. I hope it's unrelated  
22 to this discussion.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. DOREMUS: He's a remarkably prescient  
25 guy.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. DOREMUS: To Julie's point, another  
3 thing. We talked about this briefly at state  
4 directors. In addition to what is being funded, I  
5 think we could do a whole lot better as a community on  
6 why, strong messages about why we need this funding  
7 and how the nation benefits from it. We start every  
8 discussion with the Secretary when we go brief the  
9 Secretary on what we're doing with here is the  
10 economic value of the nation's marine fisheries, the  
11 sectors that are dependent upon fishing interests of  
12 various sorts, and even the economic and social value  
13 of protected resources.

14 Whale watching is a multi-billion dollar  
15 industry, you know. Folks don't think in those terms.  
16 They think that this is just, you know, a Marine  
17 Mammal Protection Act thing. It's about what's nice  
18 to do, but that there's huge livelihoods that depend  
19 upon, not to mention, you know, fisheries'  
20 interactions with protected species and all that  
21 complicated stuff we all know about.

22 That message is not readily known, nor is it  
23 powerfully communicated by all of us I think. So  
24 working with commission directors, with states, with  
25 all of us on understanding why the public gets far

1 more out of what they invest in this whole enterprise  
2 is something that we should pay a lot of attention to.  
3 You might call it marketing, messaging, whatever, but  
4 it is very significant for people to understand why  
5 these investments pay off to the American people. And  
6 I think collaboration on that piece as well as the  
7 composition of funding, which we're all really dialed  
8 into, that's as important.

9 And if you'll indulge me, I do need to  
10 return the call quickly. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Other member  
12 comments or questions? Julie?

13 MS. MORRIS: Maybe Dave can comment on this  
14 as well, but another problem with the stock  
15 assessments is when you have a species like red  
16 snapper, a stock like red snapper that's very highly  
17 contested and there's a lot of economic value based on  
18 it. The council has been calling for kind of out of  
19 sequence updates like when they're faced with a tough  
20 management decision regarding red snapper, you know.  
21 It's not time for a new stock assessment on red  
22 snapper, but they'll say, well, could you run the data  
23 again with the more recent data and tell us if  
24 anything has changed.

25 And so that takes a tremendous amount of

1 time at the Science Center to respond to those  
2 requests. And I don't think the updates are really  
3 illuminating a clear path for a tough management  
4 decision. So maybe some discipline on the part of the  
5 councils about how frequently they ask for updates of  
6 an assessment that is already very strong in terms of  
7 its science, but it is contested and leads to tough  
8 management decisions.

9 MR. DONALDSON: And sort of to defend the  
10 council, part of the issue with red snapper is the  
11 biomass is increasing, and that has the potential to  
12 have an effect on past assessments and future  
13 assessments.

14 But, yeah, there's times that we had a  
15 discussion at a recent council meeting where there's  
16 various types of assessments and they wanted to do an  
17 assessment that really wasn't necessary, but they were  
18 adamant because this is what they felt they needed.  
19 And looking at that and making sure that in this day  
20 and age where we have limited resources that what  
21 we're doing is actually gaining us something is  
22 probably a good approach.

23 But there is some argument for doing more  
24 assessments. I mean, I don't think that we're doing  
25 red stock assessments on a timely enough basis just

1       because of the expanding biomass.

2               MR. CHATWIN:  So thank you, Mr. Chairman.  I  
3       just want to sort of add a piece of information into  
4       the discussion about stock assessments.  On Friday,  
5       the GAO issued a report on "Fish Stock Assessments  
6       Prioritization and Funding," which I don't know.  I  
7       imagine this reflects information that they collected  
8       from the Agency, but it's not the Agency's document.  
9       But there is a table here which, Randy, are you  
10      familiar with this document?  Okay, because there's a  
11      table here that says number and frequency of fish  
12      stock assessments, and they're divided by region, by  
13      science center actually.  So there is a breakdown.

14             Now it doesn't have the information on what  
15      proportion of the stocks that is and why they decided  
16      that, but it's an interesting read, and I just want to  
17      make sure everybody had heard about it.  Thanks.

18             MS. BONNEY:  So I was just going to comment  
19      that there is a breakdown on stock assessments because  
20      of funding cycles.  And so, in the North Pacific,  
21      because you're reaching out to commercial vessels for  
22      charter and you've got to get the bid out in time for  
23      the commercial vessels to bid on those charters and so  
24      any kind of continuing resolution -- I need Paul here.

25             But there are certain elements of the

1 budgeting cycle, if they're disjointed, they run out  
2 of time to get. So I know at least in our region  
3 we've lost two vessels we needed because they couldn't  
4 get the contracts out on time to get them on the  
5 street so the vessels could actually bid on them. So  
6 that's a simple thing in my mind to fix because the  
7 money eventually becomes available. It's just not  
8 available in the right timeline. And I don't know how  
9 we could make a poke saying you need to have the money  
10 available at X, Y, Z to make these things happen.

11 MR. DONALDSON: To that point, we've  
12 actually been talking with Paul about I guess  
13 expediting the spend plan. He talked in his  
14 presentation that they had a budget early, but they  
15 didn't have an approved spend plan until midyear,  
16 which was frustrating on various levels. And trying  
17 to make that a more efficient process so it doesn't  
18 take six months, almost seven months to get an  
19 approved spend plan and then they get millions of  
20 dollars that they have to spend in three and a half  
21 months.

22 And it's just, it's a very inefficient way  
23 to operate. We're hoping that through talking with  
24 the right folks that we can make that a more efficient  
25 process so the money is available when it's needed and

1 we can conduct data collection, stock assessments,  
2 things along those lines.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Thank you,  
4 everybody, for an engaged discussion on the activities  
5 of the state council and all the members with the Q  
6 and A. That was helpful. It is 1:52, and the next  
7 item was supposed to start at 2, but I'm going through  
8 the agenda realizing there are no breaks programmed  
9 in. So I'll give us a 10-minute break right now. And  
10 I see Roger is here for the next presentation, so  
11 we'll look forward to starting that in 10 minutes.

12 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

13 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Thanks,  
14 everybody. We're reconvening. Just checking here.  
15 Ted, are you on the phone and can you hear us? Ted,  
16 we're checking if you're on the phone and if you can  
17 hear us.

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So we'll hope  
20 that Ted is there and that he can hear us. And in the  
21 meantime, I'd like everybody to meet Roger Griffis  
22 from the Office of Science and Technology. He's been  
23 on a number of phone calls with us helping plan this  
24 agenda item and what NOAA has planned for MAFAC and  
25 how we can play a role in advising on climate change.



1 And I'm looking forward to Roger's presentation.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. GRIFFIS: Great. Thank you very much,  
4 Keith, and thank you for inviting me to be with you  
5 today. It's a pleasure to talk about this important  
6 issue of our changing climate and what it means for  
7 the NOAA Fisheries Service, the resources we care  
8 about, and the people that use them. I'm actually a  
9 little warm. If you don't mind if I take the jacket  
10 off before I begin.

11 And as you can tell from the title, I want  
12 to try and do two things, three things actually. I  
13 want to talk a little bit about the challenges and  
14 opportunities of doing the NOAA Fisheries Service  
15 mission in a changing climate. But really the  
16 purpose, this is all just context for you all to  
17 consider the proposal that's in front of you, which is  
18 to establish a subcommittee to give us advice and  
19 input in your capacity as a federal advisory committee  
20 on how the Fisheries Service can prepare for and  
21 respond to the changing planet, the changing oceans,  
22 and changing resources.

23 So that's really the outline of the  
24 presentation. I'm going to try and throw in examples  
25 where I can. I'm going to begin by a quick overview

1 of what's changing, our changing climate, changing  
2 oceans, the premise being that we should care because  
3 that impacts the resources we're talking about and the  
4 people that depend on them. We should care a lot  
5 because it also impacts our ability to do our mission,  
6 and there are things we can do to prepare and should  
7 prepare for change. One of those is for you all to  
8 perhaps form a subcommittee to help provide advice and  
9 input on this.

10 Obviously this is an issue that a lot of  
11 people are thinking about, and I put this here in part  
12 just to remind us that it's kind of opportune that  
13 we're having this conversation today. Over the  
14 weekend, 350,000 people marched in New York City  
15 concerned about changes in the climate. Today  
16 President Obama speaks to a roomful of 100-plus other  
17 leaders around the world. They're talking about how  
18 our planet is changing and what we can do about it.

19 And the planet is changing, and in a variety  
20 of ways you can see that. The planet is warming up  
21 and it's warming up faster than we've ever seen before  
22 across basically the entire globe. And this is  
23 usually the scene that people see. They see over the  
24 past 100 years where basically the change -- again,  
25 it's an average over that 100 years -- is going from

1 below the average up until about 1940 or 1950, and  
2 then the years started ticking up and getting warmer  
3 and warmer. And the past three decades have set all-  
4 time records and each time a warmer decade, a warmer  
5 decade, a warmer decade.

6 But I actually like this plot of it because  
7 it puts it in a bit more perspective. This is a plot  
8 going back 10,000, I don't know, 12,000 years, and it  
9 shows the trajectory that the planet had been on kind  
10 of coming out of the last Ice Age, and so it's another  
11 perspective. A hundred years is nice, but the  
12 geologists always remind me that that's nothing.  
13 That's the blink of an eye.

14 And, in fact, we need to understand the  
15 pulse and change of this planet which goes through  
16 changes, and so this is an important perspective. And  
17 hopefully you've already figured out that that  
18 previous graph I showed you of 100 years is this one  
19 purple line right here at the end. So you can see the  
20 planet's been on a trajectory of change. There's  
21 changes in here, but basically, you know, coming out  
22 of Ice Age it was warming. We were on a cooling trend  
23 until something started happening somewhere in here.  
24 That's about, you know, 1,500 years ago, but  
25 particularly something happened right in here back

1       about 100, 150 years ago.

2               And the scientists tell us that that  
3       something that happened is also directly related to  
4       human activity, that basically the growth of the  
5       industrial age, the emissions of CO2 in the atmosphere  
6       creates a blanket that traps heat and that that heat  
7       is really directly related to that spike in  
8       temperature that I just showed you.

9               And again, this is the perspective. If you  
10      look from the '50s to now, you'll see a gradual  
11      increase in the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere.  
12      That's what that one is. But if you look back, again,  
13      it's important to get some perspective on this, you  
14      know. Is this just part of a natural cycle? Does  
15      this really change or not?

16              So that spike is where -- oops. Sorry. The  
17      bubbles fell off as I moved this back and forth, but  
18      that bubble is about where we are now. And this is  
19      showing a trend of CO2 levels basically back 10,000  
20      years that I showed you. Remember that was at 10,000  
21      years. But you can go back, oh, I don't know, several  
22      hundred thousand years, and you can see that the  
23      planet has kind of a breathing cycle, if you will, of  
24      ups and downs of CO2 concentrations, largely tracking  
25      temperature. And I won't go through it. You know, we

1 can talk about the paleogeology and what does that.

2 But the most important thing that we're very  
3 concerned about is this spike here at the end, which  
4 is really that last 100 years. The emissions of CO2  
5 have spiked way up, creating this blanket around the  
6 planet, which traps heat and is reflected in the  
7 growing global temperatures.

8 And why do we care? Well, we care for a lot  
9 of reasons, but this is reflected in increasing  
10 temperatures of the oceans as well. This is that same  
11 kind of trajectory over the past 100 years. You can  
12 see the tick up of sea surface temperature compared to  
13 an average.

14 And two points here. One is that while  
15 there's an overall average increase in the temperature  
16 of the ocean, it doesn't mean that every place is  
17 warming equally, that, in fact, we know oceans are  
18 complicated, and, in fact, there are places that are  
19 warming faster than others. And right away this says  
20 to us that responding to this is really going to take  
21 place at regional to subregional levels because oceans  
22 are complicated and the warming is not equal across  
23 this area. Some places are going to be facing these  
24 changes much faster than others.

25 For example, the Gulf of Maine. The Gulf of

1 Maine is warming faster than almost any other place on  
2 the planet. It's part of the top 10 or top 20 places  
3 undergoing very rapid change in temperature. And so  
4 that might be one of the areas that we might want to  
5 look at in particular both to understand the change,  
6 to understand what we might do about it, and also to  
7 prepare ourselves for possible changes in other areas  
8 as well.

9 Of course, warming of oceans and of the  
10 globe has a lot of other important impacts on the  
11 ocean system. These plots, I'll just quickly show  
12 some of those. I talked about the increasing levels  
13 of CO2 helping drive the warming of the oceans and the  
14 rest of the planet. And one of the consequences of  
15 warming water, of course, is that it expands, and much  
16 of the tick up of sea level rise is in fact due to  
17 simply the physics of warming water in addition to  
18 some addition of some other water from things like  
19 melting ice caps. And that's what this plots, summer  
20 Arctic sea ice.

21 Record levels both of sea surface  
22 temperature in many places. Also record lows in  
23 Arctic sea ice. And one of the other issues that I do  
24 need to flag, of course, since you're now well aware,  
25 I'm sure, that all that increased CO2 in the

1     atmosphere, a lot of it, actually a quarter of it,  
2     goes into the ocean. The ocean is the giant buffer  
3     for the planet. The ocean is absorbing about 50  
4     percent of the heat that's been generated with that  
5     CO2 blanket on top. The ocean has been absorbing  
6     about 50 percent of it, and it absorbs about 25  
7     percent of the CO2 that's been put up there. You can  
8     directly trace the anthropogenic CO2 and you can see  
9     that the ocean is sucking it up. It's just part of  
10    the natural physics of the ocean.

11           But the consequence is that that CO2 reacts  
12    with the water and the carbonates and it's actually  
13    decreasing the pH of the ocean in many places. That's  
14    the ocean acidification effect, and this too has major  
15    consequences for living things in the ocean. And  
16    although my talk is going to be a lot about oceans, I  
17    don't want you to think that we're not also thinking  
18    about the impacts of what's happening too close to  
19    watersheds, snowpack precipitation, and all the  
20    anadromous fish that we help manage and protect.

21           And so I put this here too. There's been  
22    particularly in the Northern Hemisphere quite a  
23    reduction in the spring snow cover, and I put that  
24    there just to reflect on the changing precipitation  
25    patterns across this country, which have significant

1       implications for things like sturgeon and salmon,  
2       those kinds of things.

3               So the last point here on what do know  
4       what's changing is that we expect that these patterns  
5       will continue; that is, all the models and all the  
6       projections are that these trends will continue. And,  
7       of course, if there are multiple projections, one  
8       assumes that relativity will somehow get a handle on  
9       CO2 emissions and we'll be able to not put as much up  
10      there. And the other one assumes that, well, we'll  
11      just continue to put CO2 up into the atmosphere and  
12      the planet will continue to warm as it is now, and  
13      then plays out those two assumptions in the various  
14      models.

15             And you can see in either case, one much  
16      less than warming, but it's still a warming effect.  
17      These yellows are projected temperature change of  
18      anywhere from zero to two degrees. The red is between  
19      two and four. The purple is between four and six. So  
20      this is kind of bracketing a future that we need to be  
21      planning for, a future that we need to be thinking  
22      about. It's certainly not a future that says we're  
23      entering an ice age any time soon. It's a future that  
24      says we should be thinking about warming oceans,  
25      increased acidity in oceans, and the other



1 consequences like perhaps less snowcap, less flow in  
2 our rivers, that kind of thing.

3 And that's exactly what the recent IPCC  
4 report said, and I'll just summarize here,  
5 particularly with the implications for fisheries and  
6 marine resources. They concluded that climate change  
7 and ocean acidification are altering ocean ecosystems  
8 in profound ways already, that those changes and the  
9 projected changes could have negative impacts on  
10 fisheries and aquaculture globally, and they go into  
11 some of those impacts.

12 They do project also positive impacts in  
13 some regions, particularly in the high latitudes where  
14 warming seas that were otherwise quite cold might  
15 allow greater productivity that might be translated  
16 into greater populations of certain fish and  
17 fisheries, and that those impacts are obviously  
18 exacerbated by other stressors, whether it be fishing  
19 or habitat loss or pollution. There is obviously  
20 interaction between these kinds of things. And then  
21 they flag the changes that present significant  
22 challenges to resource management, and that's what I  
23 want to touch on a little bit here.

24 So given these changes, there's a wide body  
25 of literature that allows us to begin playing out the

1 different scenarios for how changes in temperature,  
2 precipitation, or this carbon dioxide may ripple  
3 through the physical and chemical characteristics of  
4 the oceans, which I've just been talking about. And I  
5 didn't mention, but one could talk about the effects  
6 of warming oceans on the stratification, which, of  
7 course, as soon as you set up your stratification in  
8 the spring, that basically limits the bloom and  
9 productivity of your spring areas, particularly on the  
10 East Coast.

11           So a variety of physical factors that ripple  
12 across into the biological factors. And here's where  
13 it gets really difficult both to understand what's  
14 happening but also to project the future impacts.  
15 With changes in temperature, circulation, perhaps  
16 productivity, there could be a whole variety of  
17 impacts on productivity of the system, the phenology  
18 of survivorship, the distribution, the abundance, even  
19 the community composition of the marine communities.

20           And, of course, with those kinds of changes,  
21 depending on the magnitude, they could obviously  
22 affect what's there to be fished, how far fishermen  
23 need to go to catch that, what kind of bycatch they're  
24 running into, the whole variety of things if you start  
25 mixing up species distribution, and a variety of

1       implications on, as you can tell, the NOAA Fisheries  
2       Service mission, including our international  
3       agreements and others.

4               So part of the question is how do we prepare  
5       and how should we respond. There are a variety of  
6       places where, as you all mentioned earlier in your  
7       conversation, there may be dials that we can control,  
8       whether it be fishing effort or habitat availability,  
9       the adaptation efforts, efforts that we can do now to  
10      help build the resilience of either the resources or  
11      the communities that depend on them. And obviously  
12      there are others, not particularly in our mission,  
13      involved a lot of discussion in well, how do you begin  
14      to mitigate or get a control on the drivers in the  
15      whole system, the mitigation efforts.

16             And I want to flag here, though, that there  
17      is, as you probably know, a lot of interest in efforts  
18      to suck carbon back out of the atmosphere. And, of  
19      course, wouldn't it be great if we had some powerful  
20      tools to suck carbon back out of the atmosphere?  
21      There was a wonderful op-ed in the *Post* over the  
22      weekend, something to the effect of the title, "The  
23      Leafy Solution to Climate Change." And, of course, we  
24      have wonderful carbon suckers, and, of course, on land  
25      they're called trees and plants and things like that.

1           But there's tremendous interest now in also  
2   coastal fringe wetlands, sea grasses and mangroves,  
3   places like that that actually can exceed a tropical  
4   forest in the rate at which they suck carbon and put  
5   it down into the root system and into the benefit  
6   systems. So I wanted to flag that while we'll be  
7   talking primarily about how do we prepare and respond  
8   in our management of resources and people as things  
9   change, coastal habitats have a tremendous role to  
10   play perhaps in habitat restoration, preventing  
11   destruction of the Mekong Delta, for example, the huge  
12   wetland or the huge last coastal wetland, can have a  
13   significant role in the mitigation process.

14           So there are a lot of key questions here, as  
15   I hope you're thinking already, how well these kinds  
16   of changes affect ocean productivity. Some people  
17   would say how have they perhaps affected ocean  
18   productivity already. How will it impact species  
19   distributions, abundance? How will those then affect  
20   fishers and communities? What does resilience mean in  
21   these kind of situations and how might we promote it?  
22   And in the end, how do we best fulfill the NMFS  
23   mission in these changing times with these changing  
24   situations?

25           So I want to use an example from the U.S.

1 East Coast, partly because it's somewhat simple and  
2 illustrates some basic patterns of change. I do that  
3 so that we can illustrate and talk about some of the  
4 potential impacts and responses, but I'll say at the  
5 outset that each region is different. And I tried to  
6 say that in the beginning, that the situation in the  
7 Gulf of Mexico, the situation in the Bering Sea, the  
8 situation along our West Coast is going to be quite  
9 different because of different oceanographic  
10 conditions, climate and weather conditions, and  
11 resource conditions. But let me play out the East  
12 Coast here for a minute, and we'll talk about some  
13 real changes and real resources.

14 So along the East Coast a large marine  
15 ecosystem, and I'm talking particularly about the  
16 Northeast Shelf large marine ecosystem. But I'll talk  
17 about the Mid-Atlantic and a little bit of the  
18 Southern as well. That's kind of this thing up here  
19 with the beautiful Gulf current sweeping up here along  
20 the coast. You can see the little arrow there is Cape  
21 Cod -- I know it's twisted a bit -- you can kind of  
22 see the Gulf of Maine.

23 And over the past 40 or 50 years or so, this  
24 is the plot of average temperatures that have taken  
25 place along the East Coast. And, of course, the

1     amazing thing to first look at is look at that  
2     variability. Look at this system. Each of these  
3     systems has this tremendous, sometimes decadal pattern  
4     of cooling a decade or so or 20 years of cooling, some  
5     hot times, warmer times, then some cooling. That  
6     point right there at the end here was 2012. 2012 was  
7     the highest temperature. The Gulf of Maine and the  
8     northeast had the highest record sea surface  
9     temperatures ever recorded for this system.

10           And so it's in that kind of record-setting  
11     warmth, although it appears to be part of the natural  
12     cycle, has people concerned that this may be on an  
13     upward trend and warming. And one of the questions is  
14     what will that do to this natural cycle of change from  
15     cooler to warmer and are we on an upward trajectory.

16           And in doing that, people have asked, of  
17     course, well, what will this do to the distribution of  
18     fish stocks and other things in the region. And the  
19     answer is that, well, fish stocks have been moving  
20     quite a bit over this period, this past 40 or 50  
21     years. In fact, two-thirds, 60 percent, of the major  
22     fish stocks have all shifted their distribution  
23     poleward, largely following their preferred  
24     temperatures, if you will. And so, as this region has  
25     warmed, they've been following it northward gradually.

1           This is showing the distribution of red  
2   hake. If you look in the early part of this 50-year  
3   period, kind of the '70s, you see a lot of red hake  
4   there distributed down here into this southern Mid-  
5   Atlantic area. By the latter part of this 50-year  
6   period and now continuing, most of the southern edge  
7   of this population is gone, and it's still holding up  
8   in here in this northern area. That's the general  
9   pattern that we're seeing in many of these stocks, 60  
10   percent of them shifting their distributions  
11   northward. Some are shifting deeper.

12           And, of course, they're not all sprinters.  
13   Some of them are moving quickly. Some of them are  
14   moving slowly. And that has an impact on beginning to  
15   change the assemblages that you have. There are also  
16   changes in abundance and phenology. And one of the  
17   key questions is, of course, is this all related to  
18   temperature. I think the answer is probably no.  
19   There are other things probably going on here. But  
20   most people feel that much of this trend is due to the  
21   populations tracking their preferred temperatures  
22   given the extent of change in temperature in this  
23   region.

24           So one of the questions is, well, will this  
25   continue and what will the conditions be in the

1 future? And some interesting science and modeling  
2 going on now to try and answer that. The Atlantic  
3 croaker has been moving steadily northward. It's more  
4 of a southern species moving northward, expanding its  
5 population.

6 And as you can see from what the studies  
7 show, Atlantic croaker are going to love the future.  
8 They're a more southern species. They're sweeping up  
9 north. Some of the research shows that they think  
10 that it's moving very quickly in part because, as our  
11 winters have gotten warmer, their larvae, which are  
12 hanging out in the estuaries and the near coastal  
13 areas, are able to survive winters. There aren't as  
14 harsh winters, so the juveniles are able to survive a  
15 little bit further north. That may be helping them  
16 spread quickly, leap frog north.

17 And then if you take kind of the pace of  
18 their movement and you make some assumptions about  
19 their productivity and abundance, based on the  
20 continued warming of the system, this set of modeling  
21 projected that they may have an increased biomass 60  
22 to 100 percent in that Mid-Atlantic to northern  
23 region. And they played it out to say, well, you  
24 might be able to then increase the possible catch with  
25 these growing populations somewhere from three to 100.



1 And raise the question, well, when might this be, and  
2 reach some level where you could expand the fishery on  
3 this.

4 So I put this here just to play out kind of  
5 the research questions that are ongoing. I mean, this  
6 is very much the kind of observations that are  
7 happening and then the kind of modeling and research  
8 that's being done to ask the question are things  
9 moving, will they continue to move, and what might the  
10 implications be.

11 I put this up here to flag the importance of  
12 the observations. This is just absolutely critical,  
13 and I know you all were talking about limited  
14 resources earlier in the day and tough decisions about  
15 what do you continue to do. In this day and age of  
16 changing oceans and changing resources, long-term data  
17 sets are golden because they allow us to see what that  
18 past was and allow us to see if things are changing.  
19 Fifty-year data sets now are incredibly valuable to  
20 tell us if the world is changing and how, and that  
21 allows us to then begin to model, well, will it  
22 continue to change that way or not.

23 So I put this here partly for a couple  
24 reasons: one, to put a plug in for observations,  
25 which are notoriously difficult things to fund. But

1 the fact that the Fisheries Service and state agencies  
2 and others have been doing long-term monitoring of  
3 ocean conditions along our coast, in addition to the  
4 fish surveys that have been done, that is providing an  
5 invaluable foundation for us to understand if the  
6 systems are changing and then develop the models that  
7 allow us to project how they may change in the future.

8           So an interesting story here. You can see  
9 the black lines are the survey basically tracking  
10 where these populations are. You can see the  
11 trajectory. This is around the '70s through current,  
12 and this is the latitude here. I don't know if you  
13 can see the shadow, but it kind of goes up the East  
14 Coast, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode  
15 Island. I don't know if you can see the states.

16           And you can see that all four of these  
17 species -- this is the plotting of really the centroid  
18 of their population -- have been moving northward,  
19 that trend that I talked to you about. And one of the  
20 interesting questions, of course, is well, will the  
21 fishers follow. Fishers are very good at following  
22 the fish, so the answer you'd think is, well, of  
23 course. Of course they will.

24           And in most cases, yeah. Yeah, they are.  
25 They're following. The landings are following the

1 populations northward. The interesting situation is  
2 the red hake, of course. The landings followed the  
3 northward-moving population of red hake very well  
4 until about this latitude, somewhere in the  
5 Connecticut-Rhode Island latitude in the '80s. And  
6 what do you think why all of a sudden the fleet  
7 stopped following? Well, this particular fleet  
8 couldn't go into this area because of the gear  
9 restrictions.

10           It was a management issue that prevented  
11 them from going into this area and following this.  
12 And I'm not saying anything about that, whether it's a  
13 good, bad, or ugly thing. It was interesting to see,  
14 and it flags the kind of management issues that we're  
15 going to have to deal with as populations shift and  
16 respond to changing oceans. Fleets are going to move  
17 in different places. They're going to follow the  
18 fish. That may mean that we may need to re-look at  
19 the kind of permit processes to allow them to go in  
20 those other areas. It may bring them into the waters  
21 where other folks have the permits to take those, and  
22 it may mean that they are limited by the kind of gear  
23 restrictions that are involved here. That's why I  
24 wanted to flag that.

25           And this isn't the only place where this is

1     happening.  So this is a study done -- it came out  
2     last year -- that repeated the analysis of how fish  
3     stocks move that I just showed you on the East Coast,  
4     but repeated that analysis using NMFS stock survey  
5     data for 50 years for all of the coasts.  And you can  
6     see in three places, the ones with the arrows around  
7     them, the South Atlantic, the North Atlantic, the  
8     trajectory and each little line here is a different  
9     species or a different stock, and the big arrow is  
10    kind of the average of how that whole assemblage of  
11    commercial fish stock are moving along the coast.

12           The arrow, you can see a northward poleward  
13    moving as waters have warmed in at least these three  
14    regions and the Bering Sea as well.  In other places  
15    the arrow is going a different direction, and  
16    California, for example, the stocks are moving at a  
17    southerly direction and other things.

18           In all cases, the major movement of the  
19    stocks is tracking the direction of change in the  
20    temperature.  So the fish stocks follow the changes in  
21    temperature along all our coasts.  That doesn't mean  
22    that they're all moving the same direction because the  
23    direction of warming in those places is quite  
24    different.  It does mean, though, that we need to  
25    prepare for shifting distributions and the

1       implications of that.

2                   And I put this one here because this was a  
3       projection of how the overall warming of our oceans  
4       may affect both the distribution and the abundance of  
5       fish stocks at a more global perspective. And I put  
6       it here just partly because I wanted to flag the  
7       magnitude of some of the changes that are projected.  
8       In this study, they basically assume that fish, as we  
9       said, will follow their preferred temperatures. And  
10      what that means is that these areas in red here are  
11      estimated to possibly have a change in catch potential  
12      of a loss of somewhere between 30 and 50 percent.

13                   What that means is that tropical areas, as  
14      the ocean warms, the fish are going to move poleward,  
15      that is, out of those tropical areas. And that's  
16      going to leave very few, relatively few fish left in  
17      those tropical areas, whereas in the northern  
18      latitudes, as we said, warming oceans may increase the  
19      productivity and there might be tremendous growth of  
20      populations of fish and fisheries in those areas.

21                   And that has since been substantiated in  
22      looking at the actual catch patterns across the  
23      planet. This side of the cartoon here shows the kind  
24      of changes in the temperate ocean areas from the 1970s  
25      into in the early 2000s, and the cartoon is

1 illustrating it better than I can talk about it. But  
2 the blue fish are the more poled, cold-loving fish.  
3 The yellow and orange are tropical fish. And in your  
4 mid-latitudes, temperate Mid-Atlantic, for example,  
5 you have a mixture of those colder species and more of  
6 the southern warmer species. And into the 2000s and  
7 then the projection in the future is those areas lose  
8 their more cold water loving fish. They move  
9 northward. They're left with basically an assemblage  
10 of the more southern warm water preferred species.  
11 That may be fine if we're fishers and we can fish  
12 those if you like recreation and you like those.

13 The real trouble spots are the tropical  
14 regions. The tropical areas, no one is moving into  
15 the warm areas. So in the '70s to the 2000s, we saw a  
16 trend basically losing those more temperate fish, and  
17 we're left with basically the hardcore warm water  
18 stocks. And as projected into the future, with  
19 continued warming, as I said, there's no one left to  
20 fill those nets.

21 And basically the implication on a global  
22 perspective, these tropical areas, as you know, are  
23 aware that billions of people actually depend on these  
24 fish for their primary food and protein and everything  
25 and jobs. So a little bit of a nod towards some

1 potentially serious international issues related to  
2 shifting fish stocks and abundance.

3           So I'll just play this out. I don't know,  
4 can you guys see that? It's hard against the dark.  
5 You can't see it? Okay. Well, there's a fish sitting  
6 there, and there's a circle, and that's its original  
7 distribution by depth and latitude. This is just  
8 illustrating what we've been talking about, changing  
9 oceans from warming to acidification to perhaps  
10 hypoxia and salinity. What we're seeing already is a  
11 pattern of shifting distribution, perhaps climate.  
12 And you can see the dash line. And the implications,  
13 there are a variety of them, but one of those is that  
14 it brings it into contact with other species, perhaps  
15 competitors, perhaps predators. And that could have  
16 impact if this was our target stock.

17           The other interesting thing to think about  
18 is that we may be managing this stock in part through  
19 some protected areas that say protect the nursery  
20 grounds from impact. But with the movement up into  
21 this higher latitude, this stock no longer is using  
22 these protected areas for its nursery grounds. So,  
23 from a management perspective, we would need to  
24 rethink perhaps where these protected nursery areas  
25 are going to be, how do we put like management

1       protections on them, and also what happens to the ones  
2       that have been in a protected status in the future.

3               And as I said, this movement shift in  
4       distribution may also shift it across some kind of  
5       management or governance line. So, for example, cod  
6       along the East Coast, it may be that most of it  
7       shifts, you know, out of the Gulf of Maine into  
8       Canada. This could be a council management line, for  
9       example, and there obviously would be management  
10      issues that would need to be talked about and  
11      discussed about how do we manage things as they cross  
12      these lines that may trigger new negotiations.

13             Interesting example of that right now, the  
14      Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission having to  
15      re-look at allocations across the states along the  
16      East Coast because the shift in distribution has so  
17      dramatically changed where black sea bass, for  
18      example, is. The allocations set in the early '80s  
19      basically have little or no allocation for Maine for  
20      black sea bass because there weren't many, if any, at  
21      that time. There are now a lot of black sea bass in  
22      Maine, and so that's at least part of the reason why  
23      they're re-looking at that and having to reopen the  
24      allocation consideration.

25             So I touched on what are the impacts and



1       implications of this for how we do our job. For  
2       fisheries management, there are a whole variety of  
3       implications. It could affect how we collect our  
4       data, where we do our stock surveys, and how we do our  
5       stock assessment. It could affect the biological  
6       reference points, both shifting distributions, but  
7       particularly shifting abundance. And all of that  
8       could play into potentially affecting harvest levels.

9               I mentioned the example of allocations. It  
10       could affect where different species are and the kind  
11       of bycatch measures we need to be considering. That  
12       includes interactions with say marine mammals and  
13       other protected species, which are, although I've  
14       talked mostly about shifting fish stock distributions,  
15       which would also need to be thought about because they  
16       may be shifting distributions as well.

17              It would probably most dramatically affect  
18       the longer-term kind of management plans that we're  
19       working on. Those would be, for example, rebuilding  
20       plans. And I put aquaculture practices here just to  
21       flag for us that the aquaculture community is also  
22       thinking about the implications of shifting  
23       temperatures in oceans on what species what would be  
24       most profitable to be used in various aquaculture  
25       practices, but also how to sustain the ones that we're

1 currently doing in a changing climate. And the West  
2 Coast shellfish are a great example of that that we  
3 can talk more about.

4           Implications for protected species and  
5 habitat conservation, many of the same. Considering  
6 how current changes and potential future changes in  
7 ocean and climate conditions may affect listing  
8 decisions, a variety of basically all the activities  
9 under ESA for listing, from considerations of critical  
10 habitat to considerations of recovery planning. What  
11 would it mean to have a recovery plan for some of the  
12 salmon stocks as the thermal regime and flow regimes  
13 for the rivers from California, Oregon, and Washington  
14 change, for example.

15           It also affects priorities and practices for  
16 habitat protection and restoration. The Fisheries  
17 Service has already revised our guidance for how we  
18 design coastal wetland restoration actions so that  
19 we're taking sea level rise and storm events more into  
20 account so that we make sure that when we restore  
21 coastal habitats that we're giving it the longest  
22 service life we can possibly give it.

23           And I mentioned carbon services because this  
24 is increasingly something that many folks are thinking  
25 about should we and can we incorporate carbon services

1       into how we think about and value habitat protection  
2       and habitat restoration. We don't currently consider  
3       carbon services as one of those values and services  
4       very much when we think about should we or should we  
5       not protect habitat along the coast.

6               So change ahead. The Fisheries Service is  
7       doing a whole variety of things to begin to prepare. I  
8       wanted to flag just a few of them to give you a few  
9       examples. You probably know of others. There's  
10      actually a large effort to increase our understanding  
11      of both how oceans are changing and the impacts and  
12      our possible responses. We're trying to increase and  
13      at least shore up our ability to track the change,  
14      observations and assessments of change and what does  
15      it mean. We're assessing the resource vulnerability  
16      and also assessing community vulnerability, and I'll  
17      talk about those in just a minute.

18             We've also begun to assess, well, what does  
19      this mean for how we do our job, how we manage these  
20      resources. We just completed this year an assessment  
21      of how to better incorporate climate information into  
22      our Endangered Species Act activities and we're  
23      working on implementing those. We're also working  
24      with the Fisheries side of the house. The three East  
25      Coast councils and the Atlantic States Marine

1 Fisheries Commission held a historic workshop in April  
2 or May of this year where they came together around  
3 this issue of fisheries management in a changing  
4 climate. How do we prepare? How do we respond? What  
5 does it mean?

6 And we're also trying to understand, well,  
7 what kind of science enterprise does the Fisheries  
8 Service need to provide the information for climate  
9 ready decisions for protected species or fishery  
10 management. And to do that, we're developing a NOAA  
11 Fisheries Service climate science strategy so that  
12 we're prepared and can provide the information to the  
13 decision-makers over the next five to 10 years.

14 An example from the Bering Sea, we're  
15 tracking changes, so important. Bering Sea fluctuates  
16 between warm years and cold years, and during warm  
17 years, there are lots of small zooplankton. They're  
18 like mini-hamburgers, and the pollock don't like them  
19 very much. And so the pollock recruitment doesn't  
20 work very well.

21 But in the cold years when you have large  
22 zooplankton, pollock recruitment goes through the roof  
23 and you have a great deal. And so, by tracking ocean  
24 conditions, zooplankton, and tying it to recruitment  
25 patterns of the pollock, NOAA and partners were able

1 to provide the Fishery Management Council with state  
2 of the system information but also projections on what  
3 the state of the system may mean for recruitment in  
4 the pollock fishery.

5 And during this time of warm years right in  
6 here, based on that advice, the council reduced the  
7 harvest and the take of pollock dramatically, nearly  
8 in half over two or three decisions because of concern  
9 that if they didn't during this time of core  
10 recruitment that they may set in motion a collapse of  
11 the pollock population and stock that would take  
12 perhaps decades to recover.

13 They chose to be risk-averse. They chose to  
14 take the action to reduce and try and hold until  
15 perhaps better conditions came forward, and that is  
16 what happened. But to me it was a powerful example of  
17 the ability to use information on climate, on ocean  
18 changes at the primary productivity level, and link it  
19 and provide it to fishery managers to make decisions  
20 about a change in the future.

21 We just developed this year a methodology  
22 for rapid assessment of the vulnerability of fish  
23 stocks in a changing climate. Right now this allows  
24 us to look at 80 stocks across the East Coast, use  
25 their life history characteristics, use some

1 projections of how we think that system is going to  
2 change, and provide the managers and the scientists in  
3 that region with kind of a rapid assessment of how we  
4 think which species may be most vulnerable, which  
5 species must be least vulnerable, to help them decide  
6 where to put limited research dollars or where to do  
7 some additional considerations and management actions.

8           And I wanted to flag a growing effort, and I  
9 think, Tony, I think you mentioned this before,  
10 growing effort to better understand the implications  
11 of these changes for resource-dependent communities,  
12 fisheries and others, and what would it mean to help  
13 these communities assess their risks and take action  
14 to reduce it. What would it mean to help them be  
15 resilient in times of change?

16           Part of that I'm flagging here is a  
17 development of a community, fishing community  
18 vulnerability index to help begin to get a handle on  
19 the kinds of characteristics that make fishing  
20 communities more or less vulnerable. It's a step  
21 towards trying to help them prepare and have us give  
22 them the information that they can use to prepare.

23           And as I mentioned then, we're developing a  
24 climate science strategy to increase the production,  
25 delivery, and use of this climate-related information

1 to do our job, to fulfill NOAA Fisheries Service  
2 mission activities. It's basically designed to answer  
3 the three main questions that decision-makers, the  
4 management side, has. What's changed? What's my  
5 current situation? What's changed? The next one, of  
6 course, is the crystal ball. How will it change?  
7 What will that future be? And the only way to get  
8 there with the kind of models and projections is to  
9 better understand why it's changing and do the  
10 research on the mechanisms of that change.

11 So our science strategy is built around  
12 trying to answer those three questions, plus the  
13 fourth is to provide scenarios, options for the  
14 management community to choose from so they can decide  
15 what the best action is to take, whether it be through  
16 fishery management, protected species conservation,  
17 habitat, or community resilience.

18 This is, of course, one of the first tasks  
19 or opportunities we're asking you to help us with.  
20 We're hoping that by forming the Subcommittee on  
21 Climate Change and Marine Ecosystems, one of the first  
22 things we'd like you to do is to give us some feedback  
23 on this climate science strategy. It lays out  
24 basically a foundation for science to support climate  
25 ready NOAA Fisheries, beginning with understanding the

1 current status and what's changing, providing robust  
2 projections of future change, and then allowing us to  
3 then provide management with robust management  
4 strategies and climate-informed reference points and  
5 give us the foundation for the science enterprise to  
6 produce and deliver this information.

7           So part of the message I'm hoping that I've  
8 communicated is this is a critical time to improve our  
9 understanding of how the world is changing and the  
10 implications on our resources and our job, whether it  
11 be changes in precipitation in snowpack and drought on  
12 our West Coast affecting protected species in the  
13 streams, whether it be changing ocean temperatures,  
14 providing thermal stress, leading to shifting fish  
15 stock distributions who are threatening things like  
16 coral reefs, or whether it be, again, another  
17 consequence of a warming planet, the loss of sea ice  
18 affecting ice-dependent species.

19           The ripple effects are going to be many, and  
20 this is the time to prepare and to figure out how we  
21 can best respond, how can we help managers and make  
22 climate ready fishery management decisions, climate  
23 ready protected species decisions.

24           And so we're hoping that you'll join with us  
25 in this important time. The proposal, as you know,



1       that we can now talk about is for you to form a  
2       subcommittee to help advise on these tough issues as  
3       we all walk forward into a changing world, the  
4       question being climate ready NOAA Fisheries Service,  
5       how do we fulfill our mandate in the midst of a  
6       changing world? Thank you.

7               CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Roger.  
8       That's an impressive presentation, and I'm wondering  
9       if you could talk a little bit about the ongoing fish  
10      stock climate and vulnerability assessments and how  
11      that ties in and what's been happening there because I  
12      think it directly relates to your presentation.

13             MR. GRIFFIS: Sure, I'd be happy to. And  
14      I'm hoping that I'd be happy to, unless you want to  
15      also talk about the details of the proposal for the  
16      subcommittee and all that, whenever you're ready.

17             So about two years ago the Fisheries Service  
18      began to develop this new methodology for doing these  
19      rapid assessments. We were inspired to do that by our  
20      colleagues in the terrestrial wildlife management  
21      conservation community who had almost a decade ago  
22      begun developing tools for rapidly assessing potential  
23      climate impacts on forested ecosystems and grassland  
24      ecosystems wildlife.

25             So we were partly following, trying to play

1 catch-up a little bit following the footsteps of  
2 others in the natural resource management community.  
3 And we were fortunate that the Australians had already  
4 developed a similar methodology for fisheries, and so  
5 we built off their efforts.

6 As I said, the goal was to be able to  
7 provide the science and management community with a  
8 quick assessment of what species we thought would be  
9 perhaps most vulnerable to significant change and  
10 those that we thought would be least vulnerable, not  
11 that that would be the end-all but that that would be  
12 a guide to where we might put our limited science  
13 dollars for the more detailed modeling and assessment  
14 that would be needed.

15 We were marching along spending three years  
16 on tremendous science on one or two species, you know,  
17 creating entire Ph.D.s on assessing how Atlantic  
18 croaker, you know, the whole study of how they mate.  
19 But we realized that at the pace we were going we were  
20 not going to be able to provide the kind of  
21 information and the demand that was growing quickly  
22 over the past two years even from councils, from our  
23 own management entity.

24 So that was the rationale behind developing  
25 a protocol. It was grounded in a lot of other

1 experience on the terrestrial side, grounded in what  
2 other countries were doing. And basically, as I put  
3 up, in some sense it's very simple. It uses the life  
4 history characteristics of a species and basically has  
5 experts on that species rank the species, its  
6 sensitivity to changes in say temperature or salinity  
7 or something like that.

8           So you can imagine, and I'll simplify it,  
9 that, you know, a species that puts out millions of  
10 eggs regularly is a very productive spawner, has a  
11 large population size, has a huge range, so you can  
12 tell it already can handle a variety of temperatures,  
13 is probably going to end up as least vulnerable, one  
14 of the least vulnerable because it can handle lots of  
15 temperatures it produces quickly. See what I mean?

16           Those kinds of life history characteristics  
17 lend itself to being not very sensitive to changes in  
18 the environment. It's just the opposite for species  
19 that perhaps have a very narrow range or very narrow  
20 preferred set of temperatures or salinities that are  
21 specialists in either diet or perhaps produce two  
22 offspring every year. I'm really exaggerating here  
23 obviously. But see what I mean? It's using what we  
24 know about life history characteristics and then what  
25 we know about the magnitude and pace of change in the

1 system they're going to be exposed to.

2 And in that sense, it's relatively a  
3 simplistic analysis, but it can be done quickly and  
4 provide, as I said, some relevant information to help  
5 frame where we would invest those limited dollars for  
6 the more detailed modeling projection. And it also  
7 might flag where we need additional monitoring  
8 information or may want to consider as we develop next  
9 generation stock assessments and other kinds of tools  
10 more on the management side where we want to focus,  
11 for what species. That was what it was designed to  
12 do.

13 We've tested it for one set of species.  
14 We've tested it along the northeast. We used the  
15 methodology to assess vulnerability of 80, about 80  
16 stocks in the northeast. We're working through the  
17 results of that. Initial feedback has been that that  
18 is going to be useful, in part because one of the  
19 products is for each species it provides a profile of  
20 the information both on their life history  
21 characteristics and the climate-related ocean  
22 conditions that they may be exposed to.

23 One of the surprising benefits of that was a  
24 whole variety of both state and NMFS people that have  
25 said that would be useful. It would be useful to have

1       that information all in one place because I'm being  
2       asked or they're being asked increasingly for that  
3       kind of information. What do we know about the  
4       potential climate impacts on species X or species Y,  
5       whether it be for, you know, a habitat consultation or  
6       other kinds of things.

7               So that's a long way of saying that's what  
8       it is. We've tested it in one region. Our hope is  
9       that it's useful and robust enough that we can use it  
10      for other regions as well. And we think that the  
11      products, not just the rankings of who's more  
12      vulnerable and who's less but the other products of  
13      pulling together this information on potential climate  
14      impacts on these species will be useful to a whole  
15      variety of users across the marine resource portfolio.

16             CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Roger. So,  
17      in the annotated agenda, it indicates that our  
18      committee has been asked to consider establishing a  
19      working group. And I raise the vulnerability  
20      assessment because, to me, it's an example of the kind  
21      of analysis that NOAA is thinking about and looking  
22      for in how to prioritize and which species do we need  
23      to be looking at and what other information do we need  
24      to go get.

25             And on the annotated agenda, it suggests

1       that we should be thinking about things like reviewing  
2       or having this working group review the NOAA Fisheries  
3       science climate plan, try to obtain national and  
4       regional perspectives, identify the socioeconomic  
5       issues and other things to help NOAA achieve its  
6       mission. So I'm looking forward to hearing questions  
7       and comments from the membership on where we go from  
8       here. Julie Bonney?

9               MS. BONNEY: I guess, is this perceived as a  
10       new initiative so that it would require additional  
11       funding, you know, to be climate ready, so to speak,  
12       or is it being done within the other missions of NOAA?

13              CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I presume we're talking  
14       about a two-step dance here, the first one being MAFAC  
15       providing feedback through the working group and then  
16       the next issue being one that would require funding,  
17       which would be if we said go do X or go do Y or go do  
18       Z as a working group, but then that would be NOAA's  
19       discretion on what to do. But I'll let Roger  
20       elaborate.

21              MR. GRIFFIS: No, I think you clarified it  
22       beautifully. There's setting up a subcommittee to  
23       provide input to us, help guide our efforts, and then  
24       whatever other things you all call for. All the  
25       activities that I described here are all part of our

1 current science efforts, management efforts. I  
2 certainly hope I didn't leave you with the impression  
3 that we've got it all covered, but that's part of why  
4 we'd like your input on are we headed in the right  
5 direction. What are the critical needs?

6 I would think that you all represent  
7 different constituencies. I think, in part, the  
8 opportunity here is for us to hear from you and your  
9 constituencies about where you see some of the needs  
10 and priorities here.

11 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Pam?

12 MS. YOCHER: I was just wondering if this is  
13 something that could fit within the existing  
14 subcommittee structure within the Ecosystems  
15 Subcommittee.

16 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So my understanding was  
17 that the hope is to be able to use the working group  
18 model in much the way the recreational fisheries area  
19 has used the working group model and be able to bring  
20 additional people into the dialogue under the  
21 framework of our committee. So while, yes, there  
22 would be MAFAC members who would be involved in the  
23 discussion and in the committee, there would also be  
24 people from outside who could get engaged in the  
25 process as well. Julie Morris?

1 MS. MORRIS: Well, that was the question I  
2 was going to ask. It seems like there has been some  
3 concern at MAFAC that the Recreational Working Group  
4 model has been kind of completely outside MAFAC and  
5 hasn't related in a really successful way back through  
6 MAFAC. So I'm hoping that if that's the model, it's  
7 not the model. It's a working group that feeds back  
8 through MAFAC and has a really good working  
9 relationship with MAFAC.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I think we as a  
11 committee have the chance to give NOAA that feedback  
12 as we come forth with our recommendation on creating  
13 this group. If you think it should be closer to  
14 MAFAC, then I think we should so state.

15 MR. WALLACE: Surely I'm rotating off, and  
16 so that's something entirely different. But this is a  
17 significant situation that MAFAC should try to collect  
18 information from all of the stakeholders throughout  
19 the nation, all of which have -- you know, we have  
20 eight regional management councils because each of  
21 those areas require different types of management and  
22 have different stimuli that drive their environmental  
23 system, which drives the things that they try to  
24 manage.

25 And so MAFAC is, you know, a select group of



1 people spread out through the country. However, you  
2 would need to have more representation from the  
3 regions who have a feel for, you know, the resilience  
4 of communities, and resilience of the down East Maine  
5 community or one of the Bering Sea is much different  
6 than Gloucester, Massachusetts, you know, which is a  
7 bedroom community for Boston. And so, you know, I  
8 think that the working group, but with MAFAC members  
9 actively participating, is a good idea.

10 MR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And  
11 thank you, Roger, for a fantastic presentation. I'm  
12 all for this idea of a working group. I've got to say  
13 I am intrigued with the request of getting this body  
14 to comment on a science plan because not that we  
15 shouldn't, but I think some of our strengths go to  
16 some of the management challenges that this issue  
17 offers, you know. So flexibility in permit and, well,  
18 assigning fishing permits so that fisheries can adapt  
19 to these changing conditions I think is one that we  
20 should maybe look at, and a body like MAFAC could take  
21 examples from around the country and try to seize on  
22 the similarities and the challenges that are being  
23 faced.

24 We've heard again and again when we talked  
25 about catch shares how important it is for fishermen

1 to be able to diversify, and I think that to me is a  
2 direct connection to this issue is in some places  
3 there will be less diversity available for fishermen  
4 to diversify with. In other places, there may be more  
5 diversity. All of them have management implications.  
6 And so I think I would put a plug in for such a  
7 working group taking on that issue as well. I'd be  
8 intrigued to hear more why the climate science plan  
9 rather than looking at some of these other issues.

10 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Roger, was your intent  
11 to have the body comment on the science plan or to  
12 provide comments on what to do with the science plan?

13 MR. GRIFFIS: Well, certainly we put the  
14 science plan forward as an opportunity. And if it's  
15 not the right fit, it's not the right fit. We thought  
16 it might be a useful way for the committee to begin  
17 thinking about the issue and perhaps framing, as Tony  
18 said, some other topics or focal areas.

19 I think the other thing that we were looking  
20 forward to was perhaps getting some input and  
21 engagement on the implementation of that science  
22 strategy because our hope is to complete it in the  
23 spring and launch in this coming year, 2015, the  
24 development of implementation or action plans within  
25 each region because, as Tony just said, the science

1 needed in the applications of those are very much  
2 regionally specific. There are common needs probably  
3 throughout them, but when you play it out, we'll be  
4 developing regional implementation plans for this  
5 science strategy, and that'll be a dialogue between  
6 the management needs for information and the  
7 application of that information.

8 So we saw perhaps the opportunity for you  
9 all to be in some way involved in or providing  
10 feedback on the development on those regionally  
11 specific science action plans. But again, if the  
12 science nexus is not the right one, there are  
13 certainly other areas that, as Tony said, that I think  
14 this group could provide valuable input on.

15 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: George.

16 MR. NARDI: Just a comment. Thank you for  
17 the presentation. I just am thinking about just the  
18 logistics, Keith. I'm all for forming a working group  
19 and trying to get more information and have MAFAC  
20 weigh in. I'm just thinking about are we talking  
21 about adding another standing subcommittee as opposed  
22 to potentially housing what Julie commented earlier as  
23 part of the Ecosystems Subcommittee.

24 I'm not against forming any additional  
25 subcommittee. I'm just worried about the thinness of

1 the people we have around the table just in terms of  
2 sheer numbers. Sometimes at the subcommittee meetings  
3 some of the subcommittees have two or three people.  
4 Others have six. And will we be dropping a  
5 subcommittee to make room? I'm just concerned about  
6 being able to properly address the issue with the  
7 people we have around the table. That's all. I just  
8 wanted to raise that point.

9 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, George.  
10 Julie?

11 MS. MORRIS: Well, I wanted to add my voice  
12 to the idea of thinking that it's a good idea to have  
13 a working group on climate science. And on this  
14 question of the science, I find the level of science  
15 that you're talking about very intriguing and very  
16 informative about management. So this rapid  
17 assessment stuff seems like it's directly related to  
18 trying to identify where we should target our  
19 management efforts in response to what's vulnerable.

20 And so I don't see an issue, as Tony does,  
21 with a working group that is interacting about the  
22 science strategy. It seems like that could be a  
23 proper role for the working group.

24 MS. YOCHAM: I was curious to hear from the  
25 Fisheries folks what types of expertise that they

1 would be seeking outside of MAFAC to bring into the  
2 working group.

3 MR. GRIFFIS: I think the model we were  
4 working under, and this is really important  
5 conversation because we too were concerned about the  
6 burden and capacity of the group here. I think the  
7 model we were working under was something of forming a  
8 working group that would have a few members from MAFAC  
9 but then would allow bringing in some other expertise  
10 and other folks to augment both expertise and time and  
11 energy. So I think that was the mental model that we  
12 had.

13 I think the expertise was an open question.  
14 There are tremendous folks working at this nexus of  
15 how oceans are changing and the implications for  
16 marine species. There's also a tremendous group of  
17 people trying to think about the management  
18 implications and what would this mean for resource-  
19 dependent communities. I'm talking about social  
20 science, economic.

21 So, in my mind, I was picturing a mixture of  
22 those so that the group could talk about both what are  
23 the management challenges, what kind of information  
24 are we going to need to address those, but also what  
25 kind of approaches are we going to need to address

1       those. So I wasn't talking about all scientists  
2       either. It could be people that are fluent in -- you  
3       know, there are people that I know on councils on the  
4       Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission that are  
5       right now thinking about these issues both from an  
6       information I need to do my job perspective. So I was  
7       picturing a mixture of both science and management  
8       folks, natural science, social science.

9               CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Columbus?

10              MR. BROWN: This has been an intriguing  
11       discussion. Last week I was at an SSC meeting for the  
12       Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council where they  
13       brought in representation from the ecosystem SSC as  
14       well as social scientists, and these conversations are  
15       so the same in terms of which direction we go in the  
16       future fishery management. And you can't talk about  
17       ecosystems management without talking about climate  
18       change and a bunch of other things and the challenges  
19       of the new science that's needed to enhance models and  
20       predictions and so forth.

21              And there was also a very strong component  
22       about engaging, you know, the social sciences, the  
23       human dimensions aspects. And, you know, in my mind,  
24       for an efficiency standpoint, it would seem like an  
25       opportunity if we were to integrate this effort with

1 the ecosystem as a working group and, you know, move  
2 both things along at the same time.

3 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So I've had the luxury  
4 of sitting in on a number of calls with NOAA staff to  
5 talk through some of these issues, and I just want to  
6 share some perspectives as to why I think we've gotten  
7 to this point in this discussion.

8 One of the questions, of course, I think,  
9 Pam, you asked basically do we have enough people to  
10 do this. And one of the constraints I think we have  
11 as a body is our charter limits us to 21 people, and  
12 we try to achieve stakeholder diversity and geographic  
13 diversity, and there's only so many people that are  
14 going to be in this room and on the travel  
15 authorizations, et cetera.

16 So having a working group gives us an  
17 opportunity to bring in more people, get them involved  
18 in the process, create some additional regional  
19 diversity, and bring in some additional expertise. I  
20 think it's very much the intention that this would be  
21 managed through the Ecosystems Subcommittee, so Dave's  
22 successor, in fact, on the agenda, it was sort of  
23 anticipated that the discussion was going to bleed  
24 into the Ecosystems Subcommittee.

25 But just as Ken Franke as the Recreational

1 Committee chair has been effectively the liaison to  
2 the working group on Recreational Fisheries, I think  
3 we as a body have the ability to say we think the  
4 ecosystems person should serve the same role and work  
5 through that committee.

6 The other thing I'm hearing some dialogue  
7 on, and I'd love to get more feedback from the  
8 members, is how would you like to define the  
9 membership of this working group? Are there certain  
10 factors that you think we should be emphasizing? When  
11 NOAA sits down to appoint those of us in the room,  
12 they've got a matrix that says we're looking at this  
13 geographic diversity and we're looking at this  
14 stakeholder diversity. Do you have suggestions of  
15 things that in your subsequent resolution on this  
16 topic, if we were to say, yes, we endorse a working  
17 group with condition A, condition B, and condition C,  
18 what would the factors be as far as what you'd want  
19 for membership? Paul?

20 MR. CLAMPITT: I want to back up just a  
21 little bit. I just want to make sure I understand  
22 this. So they develop a model, a predictive model,  
23 for future fish distribution and how that might affect  
24 communities and fishermen, and they're asking for our  
25 input on how they should use that model. Is that



1 correct?

2           And my other question is are they going to  
3 use it anyway with or without our -- I mean, is this a  
4 foregone conclusion that they're going to use some  
5 predictive model for predicting how these animals are  
6 going to react to climate change because, going back  
7 to Randy's comment earlier, where's the money coming  
8 from? And maybe I'm getting ahead. Maybe that's  
9 something that the committee should talk about is, is  
10 this something that we want NOAA to spend money on  
11 considering they're already constrained, as we heard  
12 earlier today? Also knowing that Congress isn't all  
13 that interested in this right now. We'll see what  
14 happens after November.

15           But those are what's going through my head,  
16 so I guess my question is, is this something that NOAA  
17 is going to pursue regardless and they're just asking  
18 for input on how to do that? I guess that's the first  
19 question. And the second question, where are they  
20 going to get the money?

21           CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So my opening comment is  
22 at the end of the day we're a federal advisory  
23 committee. Everything we do is advisory, and NOAA can  
24 accept or not what we say. And it's sort of the same  
25 thing with this process. I think it's a good thing

1       that they're reaching out to us and asking for  
2       additional stakeholder feedback. You know, we may  
3       give it. It may be on a predictive model. It may be  
4       on something else. And if we do a good job and give  
5       them good insights, we will hope that they listen to  
6       us. So I see it as an opportunity for us as opposed  
7       to a challenge. But I know Paul wanted to add.

8               MR. DOREMUS: So I'll provide just a few  
9       observations on really good questions that came up,  
10      yours, Paul, as well as others, in the course of this  
11      conversation from my vantage point that may be  
12      somewhat helpful for context here on our ask.

13             This is an issue that I think used to be  
14      thought of as a nice thing to do in addition to our  
15      core work. And we have come to realize, have known  
16      for some time I think, and gradually I believe our  
17      budget and policy stakeholder community has come to  
18      this point as well. And, more importantly, the people  
19      that we do our work for are asking us to do this.

20             It used to be you controlled fishing  
21      pressure and you could predict where your stocks are  
22      going to go, and that's not the case anymore. We are  
23      seeing stocks move, abundance, distribution, in ways  
24      that aren't a function of fishing pressure alone.  
25      There's huge system stressors, as Roger very clearly

1       laid out, and we don't understand how a lot of these  
2       are actually working.

3               So, in many respects, we view this as  
4       getting within our existing resource constraints at a  
5       minimum, getting the information that we need to  
6       perform our fundamental management roles. This isn't  
7       science for science. This is science for management.  
8       That's what our whole science enterprise is for, and  
9       that's why we think a body, a MAFAC working group, you  
10      know, a subset of this body would be a very effective  
11      tool, an advisory tool, for helping us look at our  
12      existing work portfolio that's informed by this  
13      thinking, whether there are major gaps given what  
14      we're able to do with our existing resources, how best  
15      to approach other partners.

16             We're working internally, for example, with  
17      the Office of Atmospheric Research to look at how best  
18      we can incorporate climate information that already  
19      exists into models relevant to marine resource  
20      management. So this is not something that we  
21      necessarily feel that we can to continue to meet our  
22      existing mission functions, that we can wait for new  
23      money for. We're being asked to do this by councils.  
24      We're being asked to do this by all kinds of  
25      constituent interests in our management side of the

1 house. And given the very resource constraints that  
2 we're under, we want to make sure that we use our  
3 limited resources, our existing scientific capacity,  
4 the scientific input from other organizations to  
5 greatest effect and in the areas with the greatest  
6 need. And those are choices that are available to us,  
7 and the advice that this working group could provide  
8 would be very instructive and very helpful in making  
9 choices about how to use the very limited resources  
10 that we have to greatest effect.

11 So that's in general. I don't know, Roger,  
12 with your close involvement in this if you would care  
13 to embellish on some of these broader themes. But  
14 that's why we are here and what the underlying  
15 motivation is and how we generally view the topic.  
16 And when it comes to recalling this climate ready NOAA  
17 Fisheries Service, this really is about understanding  
18 what's happening to the resource. It's not about  
19 climate theories. It's about observed changes in the  
20 environment, what's driving it and what direction it's  
21 going in and what does that mean for management.

22 So the emphasis here really is on management  
23 choice, and that's really what our starting and ending  
24 impulse is with this. It's not about the pursuit of  
25 climate science. It's about understanding what's

1 going on in the natural environment.

2 MS. EDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank  
3 you for the excellent presentation. That was really,  
4 really helpful. And I hear that NOAA is asking MAFAC  
5 to do this, so you're asking for our input. And so it  
6 seems to me that MAFAC should move forward in whether  
7 it's a working group or the Ecosystems Subcommittee to  
8 undertake this.

9 What I'm having difficulty with, a hard time  
10 with is maybe a question I don't need to ask, but I'm  
11 having a hard time getting my head around how this is  
12 going to happen. I know we're a national committee  
13 advising NOAA nationally, but it seems to me that a  
14 top-down approach for MAFAC is kind of a difficult one  
15 to take in terms of looking at the climate science  
16 plan. And I heard mention of what's going to happen  
17 in the spring. There will be developed regionally  
18 specific climate science plans.

19 And I think, to me, the real key, important  
20 issue is that those plans be regionally specific for  
21 all the reasons that everybody else has mentioned  
22 here. And I'm wondering if maybe -- I understand that  
23 maybe MAFAC would want to have input from the top down  
24 on NOAA's climate science policy, but I'm wondering if  
25 MAFAC would have -- our work and our time would be

1 better used if once those regionally specific climate  
2 science plans have been developed, that they then come  
3 to MAFAC as part of the process for comment and review  
4 because it seems to me, for me, it's kind of concrete.  
5 That's something I can get my hands on, my head around  
6 a little bit more because we have national  
7 representation from different constituencies and we  
8 have the expertise to look at these different regions  
9 and talk about things that we know are important to  
10 us.

11 So I'm supportive of moving in that  
12 direction. Just from an organizational and resource  
13 standpoint, I have a better time seeing a vision of  
14 what we're going to do when I have something concrete  
15 in front of me to make a recommendation from. So just  
16 my thoughts. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I want to mention  
18 something in light of Michele's comment and Julie's  
19 comment earlier. What we're talking about is a  
20 working group, which is really effectively just like a  
21 subcommittee within MAFAC. It has no independent  
22 authority. Anything that comes out of that working  
23 group would then have to go through MAFAC, be  
24 discussed by MAFAC. If they were commenting on a  
25 regional plan, then we would see that regional plan.

1 We would see the comments that came from that working  
2 group, and it would be up to us to decide what to  
3 recommend to NOAA.

4 So I know that that seems a little different  
5 perhaps than some of the past experience because of  
6 what happened with one document from the Recreational  
7 Group. But I want to point out that one of the tasks  
8 we had gotten on the Recreational Group was to gather  
9 together recreational perspectives, and then we simply  
10 forwarded that on without having a deliberation in the  
11 body about did we agree or not. It was nothing more  
12 than the task of assembling the information.

13 Here, if we're talking about endorsing or  
14 recommending or agreeing with some recommendation that  
15 comes from this working group on a specific document,  
16 we as a body would have the chance to do it. That's  
17 the whole point of having a working group. So I just  
18 wanted to make sure that everybody was clear on how  
19 that functions.

20 MR. DYSKOW: Keith, you addressed almost  
21 half of what I wanted to say. I wouldn't discount the  
22 effectiveness of a working group. The Rec Fishing  
23 Working Group -- both Russ and Ken are not here today.  
24 But it's a tool for NMFS just as much as it is a tool  
25 for the Rec Fishing Subcommittee. So I think it is

1       accomplishing much of what NMFS wants in that it's  
2       giving broad-based feedback from the field.

3               Yes, it has to be managed differently. I  
4       totally agree with you. But I think the Rec Fishing  
5       Working Group was set up the way it is for a specific  
6       reason. This is a different reason. It could be set  
7       up differently. So I don't think we should throw the  
8       whole concept out. It's a good concept. And frankly,  
9       we don't have the resources. If we want to address  
10      this in a meaningful way, let's get grassroots experts  
11      from around the country and develop a working group  
12      that can really provide the feedback and the input  
13      that NMFS is asking us for because I don't think we  
14      can. We can maybe perhaps oversee that, but I don't  
15      see another alternative. We don't have that resource.

16             MR. WALLACE: Yeah. You know, that's  
17      exactly how I saw it too. If this group tried to get  
18      into doing a report on each region, an in-depth, you  
19      know, you would just get bogged down and wouldn't be  
20      able to get anything done. And so what you could have  
21      is two or three members of MAFAC on the working group  
22      and then the working group actually be a whole series  
23      of subgroups that have a specific task on a region-by-  
24      region basis just as a practical matter of how you  
25      manage the process, and especially if they want it by



1 the spring of 2015. That's only six months away.

2 And so somebody has to really get with it  
3 and appoint this group and get them coordinated and  
4 get them moving. And you're not going to do it with  
5 this group because we won't meet for another six  
6 months or you won't meet for another six months.

7 MS. EDER: I'm not sure, you know, what  
8 clear recommendation I can really make at this point,  
9 but I think I guess what I'm doing is even questioning  
10 whether or not as MAFAC we want to establish a working  
11 group at this point. And perhaps we could establish  
12 it as participants in name only.

13 But I guess what I'm saying is that we  
14 should wait and wait until we get the regionally  
15 specific climate science plans, have those come  
16 forward to MAFAC, and then whether we have the  
17 subcommittee review them and make recommendations to  
18 the full committee, because that to me just seems to  
19 be the time and workload approach that NOAA might get  
20 the best recommendations from us as a group going  
21 forward. And that's just another suggestion on the  
22 rainbow of alternatives here as to how to proceed.

23 MR. WALLACE: You know, and I hear you,  
24 Michele. This could be one of the most meaningful  
25 things, if not the most meaningful thing, that MAFAC

1 has ever done. But if you're going to do something  
2 meaningful, it's going to be very hard. And if you're  
3 not willing to say, okay, damn the torpedoes, we're  
4 going to go ahead and we're going to see if we can  
5 actually do something constructive since we are under  
6 a very, very limited time constraint, that's fine.  
7 And if we don't think that we can do it or if we  
8 collectively don't want to do it, then we need to say  
9 that and then that's fine, except, you know, they  
10 asked for advice and we chose not to give it to them.  
11 And so I have some misgivings about taking that  
12 attitude.

13 MS. BONNEY: So I guess I'm trying to  
14 understand process. So basically we're going to  
15 create a climate committee and we would figure out the  
16 structure, and then that committee would report to  
17 MAFAC, and then MAFAC would be making recommendations  
18 to NOAA and the Secretary of Commerce. That's the  
19 flow of what you're talking about right now.

20 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: So I'd like to be more  
21 precise. We're not talking about a committee because  
22 we're not talking about charter amendments. We're not  
23 talking about modifying the structure. We're talking  
24 about this existing within effectively the Ecosystems  
25 Committee. We're talking about endorsing the idea of

1 a working group, and what I've heard from the  
2 membership, and respecting Michele's position of wait  
3 and let's do it on a smaller basis. I've heard many  
4 members say we should have the chairman of the  
5 Ecosystems Subcommittee as the working group leader.  
6 We should ensure geographic and professional diversity  
7 in a way that supplements the existing skill sets we  
8 have at the table. We should emphasize that MAFAC  
9 have the opportunity to comment on anything that comes  
10 out of the working group, right?

11 Those seem to be three really important  
12 considerations for the membership. But with those  
13 understandings, we would be endorsing the notion of  
14 creating a working group. And then I think, by the  
15 way, all the members would have an opportunity to make  
16 recommendations on people who would be good people to  
17 serve on this kind of working group.

18 MS. BONNEY: So then in terms of the chain  
19 of authority then, is the committee making  
20 recommendations to the Secretary of Commerce, or is  
21 MAFAC?

22 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Everything comes through  
23 MAFAC.

24 MS. BONNEY: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: The chairman of the

1 Ecosystems Subcommittee, David's successor, would  
2 effectively be the liaison for this committee just the  
3 way that Ken Franke is for the Recreational Working  
4 Group. Everything would come through that  
5 subcommittee, be vetted by the subcommittee within  
6 MAFAC, and be discussed by MAFAC as a body.

7 MS. BONNEY: Okay. So just one more thing.  
8 You know, I'm trying to look at if I was brought in as  
9 an outside person, not a MAFAC member, to sit on that  
10 committee. It seems to me you would have to have a  
11 very well thought out mission and goals for that  
12 group. Otherwise, they may be completely off charter  
13 in terms of what our expectation is.

14 And so I would hate to be sitting on the  
15 committee, find out that MAFAC didn't want to do  
16 anything that they suggested because the charter  
17 wasn't well defined for what that work group was  
18 supposed to come up with. So I guess my question to  
19 you as the chairman and whoever would be the Ecosystem  
20 chair is, how do you define the box of the work  
21 group's responsibilities so everybody feels satisfied  
22 at the end of the day?

23 MR. WALLACE: And I didn't get into it, but  
24 actually I thought about that. You know, one of the  
25 things, one of the weak points right at the moment is

1 the NOAA staff simply because they have an acting  
2 leader for policy, you know. If Mark was here, who  
3 had had 20 years' worth of experience, you would say,  
4 well, they're going to have to ramp up to some extent  
5 because there's going to be a lot of work they're  
6 going to have to do in providing information. Then  
7 Science and Technology is going to have to get  
8 involved in that because you can't run this in a  
9 vacuum, and we surely don't want to be doing work that  
10 they're already doing, you know.

11 If there's an issue, then we say what do you  
12 know about it, and they say we've already done that  
13 and here it is for each region. So we're not trying  
14 to invent, write all these things from scratch. We're  
15 really going to accumulate information and have people  
16 that are experts in that region to actually massage  
17 this into a management and resilience plan for the  
18 communities. And so you're going to have to rely on  
19 NOAA for a lot of the expertise because they've  
20 already done the work.

21 MS. MORRIS: So, Julie, maybe you've already  
22 looked at it, but there is in our annotated agenda a  
23 charge for this working group and a list of initial  
24 actions. Are you calling for something that's more  
25 specific in detail than that?

1 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Tony, and then Pam.

2 MR. CHATWIN: Thank you. So I like the  
3 charge that's in this, in the annotated agenda. I  
4 think it's good because it's broader, and that  
5 addresses my previous comment, which was just focused  
6 on the science plan. But here I like it because it  
7 broadens that out. And I think of Julie's comments on  
8 we need to flesh out sort of the objectives for the  
9 working group. This is a charge with the actual  
10 objectives, what the deliverables are and whatnot. I  
11 think that is something that we need to think about a  
12 bit.

13 And then I had another question back on the  
14 science plan. Here it says a draft science plan in  
15 the fall of 2014. Is that available? If it's  
16 available, we could take a look at it and maybe, you  
17 know, progress on this issue over these three days.

18 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Roger, can you answer  
19 that?

20 MR. GRIFFIS: So it's just finished internal  
21 review within the Fisheries Service. We are about to  
22 go outside the service for review and input from  
23 sister agencies within NOAA. If that would help your  
24 consideration, we can certainly make a copy of it  
25 available.

1           I am very sensitive to your comments,  
2    though, about, you know, is this the right body to  
3    provide input on a science strategy. I think really  
4    that's something for you all to wrestle with. I think  
5    you probably could provide or this working group could  
6    provide valuable input on it.

7           But really the strategy is designed to meet  
8    management needs, and so we were thinking in that  
9    sense, you know, providing some input on have we  
10   captured best those management needs at least from  
11   your perspective or your constituencies' perspective.  
12   And maybe it's an initial task that then helps the  
13   working group and MAFAC identify some more targeted  
14   issues that you all would like to help pursue. And we  
15   certainly would be interested in talking with you  
16   about that.

17           The issue of fishing community resilience in  
18   these changing times is and how does one best foster  
19   that is a key issue, Tony, as you said before. That  
20   one might lend itself to a useful task.

21           MS. YOCHER: I'm also mindful of Michele's  
22   concerns, but I echo Julie's comment that this is  
23   something NOAA Fisheries has asked us to do, and so  
24   I'm reluctant not to do it because I think part of our  
25   task is to provide them with the input and the help

1       that they need.

2                   And then the other comment that I wanted to  
3       make was to Julie Morris's comment about how the  
4       Recreational Fishing Working Group did or didn't work.  
5       One way that we can make sure I think that there's  
6       better interaction between the two is to make sure  
7       that the chairman of the Ecosystems Subcommittee, if  
8       that individual chairs the working group, just make  
9       sure that that's not the only member of MAFAC, you  
10      know, that's involved in the working group. Make sure  
11      that, you know, any other MAFAC members really that  
12      want to be involved in the working group can be.

13                   CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I'm taking notes  
14      diligently and trying to figure out a way if I can  
15      forge consensus. And I have a question for you,  
16      Michele, recognizing your legitimate concern about  
17      making sure the regional plans get proper  
18      consideration.

19                   I'm looking at the charge that has been  
20      given and what NOAA asked us, and the second bullet is  
21      to review and provide a national perspective on  
22      regional implementation of the plan. I'm wondering if  
23      maybe we could add another bullet that says ensure  
24      that this working group committee reviews the regional  
25      plans when they come out, and if that would help to



1 mollify your concerns.

2 MS. EDER: That's a great addition.

3 MR. DYSKOW: Keith, just to provide some  
4 additional insight -- not insult, I'm sorry.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. DYSKOW: I hope it's not an insult. The  
7 Rec Fishing Working Group was a tool that NMFS asked  
8 for, and, you know, it's just human nature for them to  
9 want to use that tool as well. So I think there is a  
10 risk of losing control of that tool unless you have  
11 strong oversight.

12 They're looking for resources, and this is a  
13 resource, and now we're telling them they have to be  
14 careful how they use it. So that's a very challenging  
15 task, and I think you do need a seasoned MAFAC person  
16 overseeing the working group and also having strong  
17 communication with the climate people within NMFS  
18 because it's easy to lose control of that. The  
19 tendency will be, just like with the Rec Fishing  
20 Working Group, to use it as a resource within NMFS,  
21 not necessarily a resource of MAFAC.

22 MS. MORRIS: It sounds, Keith, like you may  
23 be ready to formulate a motion, and if you want to  
24 make that motion yourself, I would be happy as vice  
25 chair if you want to pass the gavel. That's what I'm

1 trying to communicate to you.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I guess I'll take you up  
3 on the offer, and I'll pass you the gavel.

4 MS. MORRIS: Are you ready?

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: The gavel is all yours.

6 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Keith, you have a  
7 motion you want to offer?

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: I do. I'd like to  
9 recommend the creation of a working group within MAFAC  
10 on climate change with four understandings. First,  
11 that the chairman of the Ecosystems Subcommittee is  
12 the leader of the working group and that other MAFAC  
13 members may participate. Second, that we ensure  
14 geographic and professional diversity in the working  
15 group that supplements MAFAC's membership. Third,  
16 that we ensure that MAFAC has the opportunity to  
17 comment and make final recommendations on all working  
18 group documents. And lastly, to add that regional  
19 level climate science plans should be reviewed by the  
20 working group to the list of bulleted items.

21 MR. CHATWIN: Second.

22 MS. MORRIS: So we have a second from Tony.  
23 Any further discussion of the motion?

24 (No response.)

25 MS. MORRIS: Ready to vote? All those in

1 favor say aye.

2 (Chorus of ayes.)

3 MS. MORRIS: All those opposed, like sign.

4 (No response.)

5 MS. MORRIS: Motion passes without  
6 opposition, and I'm turning the chair back to you,  
7 Keith.

8 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Julie, and  
9 thanks, everybody, for what was I think a productive  
10 discussion and one, Roger, I'm sure you found  
11 illuminating too. I'm looking forward to working with  
12 you and I'm sure all the MAFAC members are as well.

13 Let's see. We are 15 minutes ahead of  
14 schedule. I have one more thing to add here on a  
15 housekeeping measure. I have a list here of all the  
16 members and all the committees, and it's been a little  
17 while since we've done this, but I will put it over on  
18 the table or I will pass it around, the list, and I  
19 need everybody, please, to sign in on their committees  
20 that they intend to continue to participate in not  
21 just for this meeting but for the future.

22 One of the things that we try to do when we  
23 plan the agendas is to make it so that people can  
24 participate in as many of the committee meetings as  
25 possible and create as little overlap for people as

1 possible. But in light of our latest discussion, I'm  
2 sure that we may have more membership in the  
3 Ecosystems Subcommittee. Heidi, do you have some  
4 additional housekeeping for us?

5 MS. LOVETT: Let's see. So some people have  
6 asked for maps to our event, and I think Whitney is  
7 also going to, and maybe Heather as well, walk over to  
8 your hotel and be ready to help guide people over to  
9 the Science on the Sphere presentation at Building 3.  
10 That was agree? Okay.

11 MS. ANDERSON: Four-thirty in the lobby of  
12 the hotel.

13 MS. LOVETT: Yes. So we should have plenty  
14 of time for you all to be able to pack up and  
15 comfortably return to your room and, you know, put  
16 your things there and not have to carry it with you  
17 the whole way.

18 MALE VOICE: How long a walk is it from the  
19 hotel?

20 MS. LOVETT: It's about 10 minutes.

21 MALE VOICE: So we're meeting in the  
22 Courtyard?

23 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. Meet in the lobby of  
24 the Courtyard Hotel around 4:30.

25 MS. LOVETT: And so that would be great

1       since we're ending a little early. The presentation  
2       will be ready. Luis will be there at 4:30 getting set  
3       up. The door should be open. He did say that he did  
4       need to leave by 5:30 himself, so we should have  
5       plenty of time for questions.

6               And one of the things to consider while  
7       we're enjoying that presentation is, and building off  
8       what Eileen said earlier, she mentioned how we may not  
9       necessarily always articulate our story really well  
10      about what we do and the mission of NOAA Fisheries,  
11      and the Science on the Sphere is a major tool to do  
12      that. And if you all know of data sets, the group  
13      that works on Science on the Sphere is always looking  
14      for adding to the pool of data that can be used,  
15      because there are Science on the Spheres in places now  
16      across the country in museums, at the Natural History  
17      Museum here in D.C., at Goddard Space Center, and  
18      people do use it, and there's a whole library of  
19      information that people can use to share from it.

20             So it is good for us to be made aware of if  
21      there's additional information out there that you  
22      think lends itself well to the presentation that  
23      you're going to see, then we definitely welcome that  
24      kind of feedback. And that's all. And then we're  
25      meeting here same place, same time, 8:30 tomorrow

1 morning.

2 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Any other follow-up from  
3 any of the members?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Our first day is  
6 adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

7 (Whereupon, at 3:48 p.m., the meeting in the  
8 above-entitled matter was adjourned, to reconvene at  
9 8:30 a.m. the following day, Wednesday, September 24,  
10 2014.)

11 //

12 //

13 //

14 //

15 //

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

DOCKET NO.: N/A  
CASE TITLE: MAFAC Fall Meeting  
HEARING DATE: September 23, 2014  
LOCATION: Silver Spring, Maryland

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Date: September 23, 2014

David W. Jones  
Official Reporter  
Heritage Reporting Corporation  
Suite 600  
1220 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888